arXiv:1602.08811v2 [math.AP] 17 Oct 2016

ON THE BOUNDEDNESS OF PSEUDO-DIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS ON TRIEBEL-LIZORKIN AND BESOV SPACES

BAE JUN PARK

Abstract. In this work we show endpoint boundedness properties of pseudo-differential operators on Triebel-Lizorkin and Besov spaces. We assume that the symbols belong to Hörmander's class $\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}$, $0 < \rho < 1$. Our results also covers operators defined by compound symbols.

1. Introduction

Let $S(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denote the Schwartz space and $S'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the space of tempered distributions. For $f \in S(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the Fourier transform is defined by the formula

$$\widehat{f}(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) e^{-2\pi i <x,\xi>} dx \ (\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d)$$

and denote by $f^\vee$ the inverse Fourier transform of f. We also extend these transforms to the space of tempered distributions.

A symbol a in Hörmander's class $\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta}$ is a smooth function defined on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, satisfying that for all multi-indices α and β there exists a constant $c_{\alpha,\beta}$ such that

$$|\partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_x^\beta a(x,\xi)| \leq c_{\alpha,\beta}(1+|\xi|)^{m-\rho|\alpha|+\delta|\beta|} \text{ for } (x,\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{1.1}$$

and the corresponding pseudo-differential operator T_a is given by

$$T_a f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a(x,\xi)\widehat{f}(\xi) e^{2\pi i <x,\xi>} d\xi, \quad f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d). \tag{1.2}$$

Denote by $Op\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta}$ the class of pseudo-differential operators with symbols in $\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta}$. In [14], [15, p94] Hörmander showed that for $0 \leq \delta < \rho < 1$ the adjoint operator of $T_a \in Op\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta}$ belongs to the same type of class by using an asymptotic expansion, and in this case $(T_a)^* = T_{a^*}$ where

$$a^*(x,\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \overline{a}(x-y, \xi-\eta) e^{-2\pi i <y,\eta>} d\eta dy,$$

interpreted suitably as an oscillatory integral. He also mentioned that this is true when $0 \leq \delta = \rho < 1$ and we will give a proof in Appendix. The operator T_a is well-defined on $S(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and it maps $S(\mathbb{R}^d)$ continuously into itself. This extends via duality to a mapping from $S'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to itself.

Let $0 < p < \infty$, $0 < q \leq \infty$, and $s \in \mathbb{R}$. According to [24], Besov space $B^{s,q}_p$ and Triebel-Lizorkin space $F^{s,q}_p$ are defined in the following way. Let Φ be a system of functions $\{\omega_k\}$ in $S(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying

$$1 = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \omega_k(x) \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^d$$
$$Supp(\omega_0) \subset \{x : |x| \leq 2\}$$
$$Supp(\omega_k) \subset \{x : 2^{k-1} \leq |x| \leq 2^{k+1}\} \text{ if } k = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$$

The author would like to thank his advisor Andreas Seeger for the guidance and helpful discussions. Supported in part by NSF grant DMS 1500162.

$$\sup_{\substack{x\in\mathbb{R}^d\\ k=0,1,2,\dots}} 2^{k|\alpha|}|\partial^\alpha \omega_k(x)| < \infty \text{ for every multi-index } \alpha.$$

For a fixed choice of such a system Φ, define

$$B_p^{s,q} = \{f \in S'(\mathbb{R}^d) : \|f\|_{B_p^{s,q}} = \|\{2^{ks}(\omega_k \widehat{f})^\vee\}\|_{l^q(L^p)} < \infty\} \tag{1.3}$$

and

$$F_p^{s,q} = \{f \in S'(\mathbb{R}^d) : \|f\|_{F_p^{s,q}} = \|\{2^{ks}(\omega_k \widehat{f})^\vee\}\|_{L^p(l^q)} < \infty\} \text{ if } p < \infty. \tag{1.4}$$

Let's denote Besov space and Triebel-Lizorkin space by B-space and F-space, respectively. By definition the norms in (1.3) and (1.4) depend on the choice of Φ, but these are equivalent to each other with different systems. Thus, both spaces are independent of the chosen system Φ.(See [24, 2.3.2]) In this paper, we fix such a system and use a notation $\phi_k(x) = \omega_k^\vee(x)$. Then the norms on these spaces are

$$\|f\|_{B_p^{s,q}} = \Big(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{skq}\|\phi_k * f\|_{L^p}^q\Big)^{1/q}$$

and

$$\|f\|_{F_p^{s,q}} = \Big\|\big(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(2^{sk}|\phi_k * f|)^q\big)^{1/q}\Big\|_{L^p}.$$

According to those norms, B- and F-spaces are quasi-Banach spaces (Banach spaces if $p \geq 1, q \geq 1$).

Note that those are a generalization of many standard function spaces such as L^p spaces, Sobolev spaces, and Hardy spaces. We recall

$$\begin{aligned} L^p \;\approx\; h^p \;&\approx\; F_p^{0,2}, \qquad 1 < p < \infty \\ h^p \;&\approx\; F_p^{0,2}, \qquad 0 < p < \infty \end{aligned}$$

where h^p denotes the local Hardy space, introduced by Goldberg [11].

The multiplier operator

$$c_{m,\rho}(D) = \frac{e^{-2\pi i|D|^{(1-\rho)}}}{(1+|D|^2)^{-m/2}} \tag{1.5}$$

is a typical example of translation invariant $Op\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}$-operator and there are several boundedness results. Fefferman [5], Hirschman [13], Stein [22], and Wainger [26] proved that for $1 < p < \infty$ and $0 < \rho < 1$, $c_{m,\rho}(D)$ extends to a bounded operator on L^p if and only if

$$m \leq -d(1-\rho)\big|1/2 - 1/p\big|. \tag{1.6}$$

Pramanik, Rogers, and Seeger [21] showed that when $p > 2$, $c_{m,\rho}(D)$ maps $F_p^{0,p}$ into $F_p^{0,q}$ for any $0 < q \leq \infty$.

Some boundedness results also hold for general $Op\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}$-operators when $0 < \rho < 1$. Calderón and Vaillancourt [3] proved the L^2 boundedness if $m = 0$ by using an almost orthogonality technique in a Hilbert space. Fefferman [6] generalized this result to L^p boundedness when $1 < p < \infty$ with the condition (1.6) by using an interpolation theorem in [7]. Päivärinta and Somersalo [19] proved that these operators map h^p into itself for $0 < p < \infty$ if (1.6) holds.

In this note we extend the boundedness result of $c_{m,\rho}(D)$ in [21] to general $Op\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}$-operators, including the case $0 < p < \infty$.

We have the following main results.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $0 < \rho < 1$, $0 < p < \infty$, $0 < q, t \le \infty$, and $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppoe $m \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies*

$$m - s_1 + s_2 \le -d(1-\rho)\big|1/2 - 1/p\big| \tag{1.7}$$

and $a \in \mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}$. Then T_a maps $F^{s_1,q}_p$ into $F^{s_2,t}_p$ in the following cases;

(1) if $m - s_1 + s_2 < -d(1-\rho)\big|1/2 - 1/p\big|$;
(2) If $p = 2$, $q \le 2 \le t$, and $m = 0$;
(3) If $0 < p < 2$, $p \le t \le \infty$, $0 < q \le \infty$, and $m - s_1 + s_2 = -d(1-\rho)\big(1/p - 1/2\big)$;
(4) If $2 < p < \infty$, $0 < t \le \infty$, $0 < q \le p$, and $m - s_1 + s_2 = -d(1-\rho)\big(1/2 - 1/p\big)$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $0 < \rho < 1$, $0 < p < \infty$, $0 < q, t \le \infty$, and $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose $m \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies (1.7) and $a \in \mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}$. Then T_a maps $B^{s_1,q}_p$ into $B^{s_2,t}_p$ in the following cases;*

(1) if $m - s_1 + s_2 < -d(1-\rho)\big|1/2 - 1/p\big|$;
(2) if $q \le t$ and $m - s_1 + s_2 = -d(1-\rho)\big|1/2 - 1/p\big|$.

We will give some preliminary results in Section 2 and return to the proof of the above two theorems in Section 3 and 4. Our estimates are sharp in the sense that the hypothesis (1.7) is necessary and when the equality of (1.7) holds the restrictions on q, t are necessary. We construct some counter examples for sharpness in Section 5. We may extend these two results to $p = \infty$, but in this case the definition of F-spaces is a little different from (1.4) and we cannot not use L^p boundedness. We deal with the case $p = \infty$ separately in Section 6. In Appendix we will discuss how these boundedness results can be extended to compound symbols in $\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho,\rho}$.

2. **Preliminary results**

2.1. **Composition of pseudo-differential operators.** In [23, p14], symbolic calculus gives that if $T_j \in Op\mathcal{S}^{m_j}_{\rho_j,\delta_j}$ with $0 \le \delta_2 < \rho_1 \le 1$ for $j = 1, 2$, then

$$T_1 \circ T_2 \in Op\mathcal{S}^{m_1+m_2}_{\rho,\delta} \tag{2.1}$$

where $\rho = \min\{\rho_1, \rho_2\}$ and $\delta = \max\{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$. Thus, when we define

$$n_s(\xi) = \big(1 + |\xi|^2\big)^{s/2}$$

we have

$$n_{s_1}(D) T_a n_{s_2}(D) \in Op\mathcal{S}^{m+s_1+s_2}_{\rho,\rho}$$

and

$$\big\|T_a f\big\|_{F^{s_2,2}_p} \approx \big\|n_{s_2}(D) T_a n_{-s_1}(D) n_{s_1}(D) f\big\|_{h^p} \lesssim \big\|n_{s_1} f\big\|_{h^p} \approx \big\|f\big\|_{F^{s_1,2}_p}$$

from the h^p boundedness with the hypothesis (1.7). Therefore

$$T_a \in Op\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho} \text{ maps } F^{s_1,2}_p \text{ into } F^{s_2,2}_p \tag{2.2}$$

if (1.7) holds.

This allows us to assume $s_1 = s_2 = 0$ when we proceed for $0 < \rho < 1$ in this paper.

2.2. **F-spaces characterized by $L^p(l^q)$.** [24, p50]

One obtains an alternative description of $F^{s,q}_p$ spaces in the case $1 < p < \infty$ and $1 < q < \infty$.

$$\begin{aligned} & F^{s,q}_p(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ = \; & \Big\{ f \in S'(\mathbb{R}^d) : \exists \{f_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty} \subset L^p(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ such that } f = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \phi_k * f_k \text{ in } S'(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ & \text{and } \|2^{sk} f_k\|_{L^p(l^q)} < \infty \Big\} \end{aligned}$$

and furthermore

$$\|f\|_{F_p^{s,q}} \sim \inf \big\|2^{sk} f_k\big\|_{L^p(l^q)} \tag{2.3}$$

where the infimum is taken over all of such admissible representations of f.

2.3. **Maximal inequalities.** [20], [24]

Denote by $\mathcal{M}$ the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator and for $0 < t < \infty$ let $\mathcal{M}_t u = \big(\mathcal{M}(|u|^t)\big)^{1/t}$. A crucial tool in theory of function spaces is a maximal operator introduced by Peetre [20]. For $r > 0$ and $\sigma > 0$ define

$$\mathcal{M}_{\sigma,r} u(x) = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|u(x+y)|}{(1+r|y|)^\sigma}.$$

As shown in [20], one has the majorization

$$\mathcal{M}_{\sigma,r} u(x) \lesssim \mathcal{M}_t u(x)$$

for all $\sigma \geq d/t$, provided that $u \in S'$ whose Fourier transform is supported in $\{\xi : |\xi| \leq r\}$. These estimates imply the following maximal inequality via the Fefferman-Stein inequality: Suppose $0 < p < \infty$ and $0 < q \leq \infty$. Then for any sequence of positive numbers $\{r_k\}$ and $u_k \in S$ whose Fourier transform is supported in $\{\xi : |\xi| \leq r_k\}$,

$$\Big\| \Big(\sum_k (\mathcal{M}_{\sigma,r_k} u_k)^q \Big)^{1/q} \Big\|_{L^p} \lesssim \Big\| \Big(\sum_k |u_k|^q \Big)^{1/q} \Big\|_{L^p} \text{ for } \sigma > \max\big\{d/p, d/q\big\}. \tag{2.4}$$

The following is an immediate consequence of (2.4). Let $\zeta_0, \zeta \in S$ satisfy $Supp(\widehat{\zeta_0}) \subset \{|\xi| \lesssim 1\}$ and $Supp(\widehat{\zeta}) \subset \{1/c \leq |\xi| \leq c\}$ for some $c > 0$, and set $\zeta_k(x) = 2^{kd}\zeta(2^k x)$ for $k \geq 1$. Then

$$\Big\| \Big(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{skq} |\zeta_k * u|^q \Big)^{1/q} \Big\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|u\|_{F_p^{s,q}}. \tag{2.5}$$

2.4. **φ-transform of F-spaces.** [8], [9], [10]

Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the set of all dyadic cubes in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathcal{D}_k$ the subset of $\mathcal{D}$ containing cubes with side length 2^{-k}. For $Q \in \mathcal{D}$, denote the side length of Q by $l(Q)$, lower left corner of Q by x_Q, center of Q by c_Q, and the characteristic function of Q by χ_Q. For a sequence of complex numbers $b = \{b_Q\}_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{D} \\ l(Q) \leq 1}}$, define

$$g^{s,q}(b)(x) = \Big(\sum_{\substack{Q \in \mathcal{D} \\ l(Q) \leq 1}} \big(|Q|^{-s/d - 1/2} |b_Q| \chi_Q(x)\big)^q \Big)^{1/q}$$

and

$$\|b\|_{f_p^{s,q}} = \big\| g^{s,q}(b) \big\|_{L^p}.$$

Furthermore for $c > 0$ let $\vartheta_0, \vartheta, \widetilde{\vartheta}_0, \widetilde{\vartheta} \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfy

$$Supp(\widehat{\vartheta}_0), Supp(\widehat{\widetilde{\vartheta}_0}) \subset \{\xi : |\xi| \leq 2\},$$

$$Supp(\widehat{\vartheta}), Supp(\widehat{\widetilde{\vartheta}}) \subset \{\xi : 1/2 \leq |\xi| \leq 2\}$$

$$|\widehat{\vartheta}_0(\xi)|, |\widehat{\widetilde{\vartheta}_0}(\xi)| \geq c > 0 \text{ for } |\xi| \leq 5/3$$

$$|\widehat{\vartheta}(\xi)|, |\widehat{\widetilde{\vartheta}}(\xi)| \geq c > 0 \text{ for } 3/4 \leq |\xi| \leq 5/3$$

and

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \overline{\widetilde{\vartheta}_k(\xi)}\vartheta_k(\xi) = 1 \text{ if } \xi \neq 0$$

where $\vartheta_k(x) = 2^{kd}\vartheta(2^k x)$ and $\widetilde{\vartheta}_k(x) = 2^{kd}\widetilde{\vartheta}(2^k x)$ for $k \geq 1$. Then the norms in $F_p^{s,q}$ can be characterized by the discrete $f_p^{s,q}$ norms. Suppose $0 < p < \infty$, $0 < q \leq \infty$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Every $f \in F_p^{s,q}$ can be decomposed as

$$f(x) = \sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{D}\\ l(Q)\leq 1}} v_Q \vartheta^Q(x) \tag{2.6}$$

where $\vartheta^Q(x) = |Q|^{1/2}\vartheta_k(x - x_Q)$ for $l(Q) = 2^{-k}$ and $v_Q =< f, \widetilde{\vartheta}^Q >$. Moreover, in that case we have

$$\big\|v\big\|_{f_p^{s,q}} \lesssim \big\|f\big\|_{F_p^{s,q}}.$$

The converse estimate also holds. For any sequence $v = \{v_Q\}_{Q\in\mathcal{D}}$ of complex numbers satisfying $\big\|v\big\|_{f_p^{s,q}} < \infty$,

$$f(x) := \sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{D}\\ l(Q)\leq 1}} v_Q \vartheta^Q(x)$$

belongs to $F_p^{s,q}$ and

$$\big\|f\big\|_{F_p^{s,q}} \lesssim \big\|v\big\|_{f_p^{s,q}}. \tag{2.7}$$

In addition to φ-transform, we have an atomic decomposition of B- and F-spaces([9],[10]). It has the same characterization as (2.6) and (2.7), but the benefit of φ-transform is that when $l(Q) = 2^{-k}$, the Fourier transforms of ϑ^Q and ϕ_k have comparable compact supports, which guarantees that

$$\phi_k * \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}} v_Q \vartheta^Q(x)$$

can be replaced by

$$\phi_k * \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_k} v_Q \vartheta^Q(x)$$

to get the estimate (3.13) for $0 < p \leq 1$.

3. **Proof of Theorem 1.1**

Let us prove Theorem 1.1. We may assume $s_1 = s_2 = 0$.

The first statement of Theorem 1.1 follows simply from (2.2), Hölder's inequality, and the embedding theorem $l^{p_1} \subset l^{p_2}$ when $p_1 \leq p_2$. The second one is an immediate consequence of (2.2). Thus we shall prove just the third and the last statement. Assume

$$m - s_1 + s_2 = -d(1-\rho)\big|1/2 - 1/p\big|$$

and $p \neq 2$.

It suffices to show that if $a(x,\xi)$ has compact support in x variable, then

$$\big\|T_a f\big\|_{F_p^{s_2,t}} \leq C\|f\|_{F_p^{s_1,q}}$$

where a constant C is independent of the compact support. To be specific, pick a smooth function γ which is identically 1 near a neighborhood of the origin and compactly supported. Then

$$a^\tau(x,\xi) := a(x,\xi)\gamma(x/2^\tau),\ \tau > 0 \tag{3.1}$$

belongs to $\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}$ uniformly in τ. For fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\big|\phi_k * T_a f(x) - \phi_k * T_{a^\tau} f(x)\big| \;=\; \Big|T_a f\Big(\phi_k(x-\cdot)\big(1-\gamma(\cdot/2^\tau)\big)\Big)\Big|.$$

Since $T_a f \in S'(\mathbb{R}^d)$, this is bounded by

$$C \sum_{|\alpha|\le N} \Big\|(1+|\cdot|)^L \partial^\alpha \big[\phi_k(x-\cdot)\big(1-\gamma(\cdot/2^\tau)\big)\big]\Big\|_{L^\infty} \tag{3.2}$$

for some constants $C, L, N > 0$, independent of k, τ, and x. For τ sufficiently large so that $|x| < 100 \cdot 2^\tau$, (3.2) is less than $C_{N,M} 2^{-k(M-N-d)} 2^{-\tau(M-L)}$ for $M > N$ because $1-\gamma(y/2^\tau)$ and any derivatives of it vanish on $\{y : |y| \lesssim 2^\tau\}$. This gives

$$\Big\|2^{sk}\Big(\phi_k * T_a f(x) - \phi_k * T_{a^\tau} f(x)\Big)\Big\|_{l^q(\mathbb{Z})} \lesssim_{N,M} 2^{-\tau(M-L)}$$

for sufficiently large $M > 0$ and, thus we obtain

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \big\|2^{sk}\phi_k * T_{a^\tau} f(x)\big\|_{l^q(\mathbb{Z})} \;=\; \big\|2^{sk}\phi_k * T_a f(x)\big\|_{l^q(\mathbb{Z})}$$

for fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Once T_{a^τ} is a bounded operator uniformly in τ, then

$$\begin{aligned} \big\|T_a f\big\|_{F^{s,q}_p} &\le \liminf_{\tau\to\infty} \big\|T_{a^\tau} f\big\|_{F^{s,q}_p} \\ &\lesssim \big\|f\big\|_{F^{s,q}_p} \end{aligned}$$

by Fatou's lemma.

Therefore we may assume $a(x,\xi)$ has a compact support in x variable. The uniformity would be guaranteed because all of the estimates later will be made independently of the compact support. Indeed, we need this compact support assumption just for doing integration by parts in order to get (3.9).

3.1. **Paradifferential technique for Pseudo-differential operators.** The idea of our proof is based on the paradifferential technique, introduced by Bony [1]. One splits $a \in \mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}$ into three symbols as follows. Let

$$a_{j,k}(x,\xi) = \begin{cases} \phi_j * a(\cdot,\xi)(x)\widehat{\phi_k}(\xi) & j,k \ge 0 \\ 0 & \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Using this, we decompose the symbol $a(x,\xi)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} a(x,\xi) &= \sum_k \sum_j a_{j,k}(x,\xi) \\ &= \sum_{j=3}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{j-3} a_{j,k}(x,\xi) + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=k-2}^{k+2} a_{j,k}(x,\xi) + \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{k-3} a_{j,k}(x,\xi) \\ &:= a^{(1)}(x,\xi) + a^{(2)}(x,\xi) + a^{(3)}(x,\xi) \end{aligned}$$

and proceed by estimating each term separately.

Let $T^{(j)}$ be the pseudo-differential operators corresponding to each $a^{(j)}$. Then our claim is that for any $s, m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 < t \le \infty$, $T^{(1)}$ and $T^{(2)}$ satisfy the estimates

$$\big\|T^{(1)} f\big\|_{F^{0,t}_p} \lesssim \|f\|_{F^{s,t}_p} \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$\big\|T^{(2)} f\big\|_{F^{0,t}_p} \lesssim \|f\|_{F^{s,t}_p}, \tag{3.4}$$

which imply both operators map $F^{0,q}_p$ into $F^{0,t}_p$ for $0 < q \le \infty$.

3.2. **Proof of (3.3).** It follows in the same way as in [16], which is based on the following two lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. [16, Lemma 2.1],[25, Theorem 3.6]*Let $A>0$, $s\in\mathbb{R}$, $0<p<\infty$, $0<q\le\infty$ and $\{u_j\}_{j=0}^{\infty}$ be a sequence in $S'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying*

$$Supp(\widehat{u_0})\subset\{\xi:|\xi|\le A\}$$

and

$$Supp(\widehat{u_j})\subset\{\xi:2^jA^{-1}\le|\xi|\le 2^jA\}$$

for $j\ge 1$.

(1) If $\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}2^{qsj}\|u_j\|_{L^p}^q\Big)^{1/q}<\infty$, then $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}u_j$ converges in $S'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to some $u\in B_p^{s,q}$ and

$$\|u\|_{B_p^{s,q}}\lesssim\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}2^{qsj}\|u_j\|_{L^p}^q\Big)^{1/q}.$$

(2) If $\Big\|\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}2^{qsj}|u_j|^q\Big)^{1/q}\Big\|_{L^p}<\infty$, then $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}u_j$ converges in $S'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to some $u\in F_p^{s,q}$ and

$$\|u\|_{F_p^{s,q}}\lesssim\Big\|\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}2^{qsj}|u_j|^q\Big)^{1/q}\Big\|_{L^p}.$$

Lemma 3.2. [16],[17] *Let $v\in\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $b(x,\xi)$ be a function on $\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$ such that*

$$Supp(\widehat{v})\subset\{\xi:|\xi|\le 2^kA\}$$

and

$$b(x,\xi)=0\quad\text{for }|\xi|>2^kA$$

for some $A>0$. Then for all $0<r\le 1$,

$$|T_bv(x)|\lesssim\big\|b(x,2^k\cdot)\big\|_{W^{c^{(r,d)},1}}\mathcal{M}_rv(x)$$

where $c^{(r,d)}$ is the smallest integer greater than d/r and $W^{c^{(r,d)},1}$ is the Sobolev space with $\|u\|_{W^{c^{(r,d)},1}}=\sum_{|\alpha|\le c^{(r,d)}}\|\partial^\alpha u\|_{L^1}$.

Observe that

$$T_{a_{j,k}}f(x)=T_{a_{j,k}}(f*\widetilde{\phi}_k)(x)$$

where $\widetilde{\phi}_k=\phi_{k-1}+\phi_k+\phi_{k+1}$ and the Fourier transform of $u_j:=\sum_{k=0}^{j-3}T_{a_{j,k}}f$ is supported in the annulus $\{\eta:2^{j-2}\le|\eta|\le 2^{j+2}\}$. By using Lemma 3.1 we have

$$\|T^{(1)}f\|_{F_p^{0,t}}\lesssim\Big\|\Big(\sum_{j=3}^{\infty}\Big|\sum_{k=0}^{j-3}T_{a_{j,k}}(f*\widetilde{\phi}_k)\Big|^t\Big)^{1/t}\Big\|_{L^p}\tag{3.5}$$

and then apply Lemma 3.2 to get

$$\big|T_{a_{j,k}}(f*\widetilde{\phi}_k)(x)\big|\lesssim\big\|a_{j,k}(x,2^k\cdot)\big\|_{W^{c^{(r,d)},1}}\mathcal{M}_r(f*\widetilde{\phi}_k)(x)$$

for $0 < r < \min\{1, p, t\}$. For each multi-index α_1 and $|\xi| \sim 1$, using the cancellation condition of ϕ_j, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \big|\phi_j * \partial_\xi^{\alpha_1} a(\cdot, 2^k\xi)(x)\big| \\ \lesssim & \sum_{|\beta|=N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\phi_j(y)||y|^N \int_0^1 \dots \int_0^1 t_1^{N-1} \dots t_{N-1} \big|\partial_x^\beta \partial_\xi^{\alpha_1} a(x - t_1 \dots t_N y, 2^k\xi)\big| dt_N \dots dt_1 dy \\ \lesssim_N & 2^{k(m-\rho|\alpha_1|+\rho N)-jN} \end{aligned}$$

for any positive integer N, and this gives

$$\begin{aligned} \big\|a_{j,k}(x, 2^k\cdot)\big\|_{W^{c^{(r,d)},1}} &\lesssim \sum_{|\alpha|\le c^{(r,d)}} \int_{|\xi|\sim 1} \Big|\partial_\xi^\alpha \big(\phi_j * a(\cdot, 2^k\xi)(x)\widehat{\phi}(\xi)\big)\Big| d\xi \\ &\lesssim 2^{k(m+c^{(r,d)}(1-\rho)+\rho N)-jN}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\big|T_{a_{j,k}}(f * \widetilde{\phi}_k)(x)\big| \lesssim 2^{k(m+c^{(r,d)}(1-\rho)+\rho N)-jN} \mathcal{M}_r(f * \widetilde{\phi}_k)(x) \tag{3.6}$$

and finally we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|T^{(1)} f\|_{F_p^{0,t}} &\lesssim \Big\| \Big(\sum_{j=3}^{\infty} 2^{-Njt} \big(\sum_{k=0}^{j-3} 2^{k(m+c^{(r,d)}(1-\rho)+\rho N)} \mathcal{M}_r(f * \widetilde{\phi}_k)\big)^t \Big)^{1/t} \Big\|_{L^p} \\ &\lesssim \Big\| \Big(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{kt(m+c^{(r,d)}(1-\rho)+\rho N-\epsilon)} \big(\mathcal{M}_r(f * \widetilde{\phi}_k)\big)^t \sum_{j=k+3}^{\infty} 2^{-jt(N-\epsilon)} \Big)^{1/t} \Big\|_{L^p} \\ &\lesssim \Big\| \Big(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{kt(m+c^{(r,d)}(1-\rho)-N(1-\rho))} |f * \widetilde{\phi}_k|^t \Big)^{1/t} \Big\|_{L^p} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{F_p^{m+c^{(r,d)}(1-\rho)-N(1-\rho),t}} \end{aligned}$$

for N sufficiently large and $0 < \epsilon < N$ where the third inequality follows from the boundedness of maximal operator $\mathcal{M}_r$ with $0 < r < p, t$ and the last one is from (2.5). For all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, choose N sufficiently large so that

$$m + c^{(r,d)}(1-\rho) - N(1-\rho) < s.$$

This ends the proof of (3.3).

3.3. **Proof of (3.4).** Now let us consider the operator $T^{(2)}$. By setting

$$a_k(z, \eta) := \sum_{j=k-2}^{k+2} a_{j,k}(z, \eta) = \Phi_k * a(\cdot, \eta)(z)\widehat{\phi_k}(\eta)$$

where $\Phi_k = \sum_{j=k-2}^{k+2} \phi_j$, we express $T^{(2)}$ as

$$T^{(2)} = \sum_{k=0}^{9} T_{a_k} + \sum_{k=10}^{\infty} T_{a_k}. \tag{3.7}$$

The finite sum of operators clearly satisfies (3.4). For each $k \geq 10$ the kernel of T_{a_k} is

$$\begin{aligned} K_k(x,y) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a_k(x,\xi) e^{2\pi i <x-y,\xi>} d\xi \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} a(z,\xi)\widehat{\Phi}_k(\eta)\widehat{\phi}_k(\xi) e^{-2\pi i<z,\eta>} e^{2\pi i<x,\eta>} e^{2\pi i<x-y,\xi>} dz d\eta d\xi. \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Observe that in the integral the variables ξ and η live in $|\xi| \sim 2^k$ and $|\eta| \sim 2^k$. Then it has the size estimate

$$\big|K_k(x,y)\big| \lesssim_{J,N} 2^{-Jk} \frac{1}{(1+|x-y|)^N} \tag{3.9}$$

for any $J > 0$ and $N > 0$.

The idea to get (3.9) is to apply a technique of oscillatory integrals by integrating by parts with respect to each variable. First, we perform this with respect to the z-variable (we could do this due to our compact support hypothesis) and then carry out a similar process on the η-variable. Now (3.8) is dominated by

$$C_M 2^{-k(2M-d)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Big| \int_{|\xi|\sim 2^k} (I-\triangle_z)^M a(z,\xi) e^{2\pi i<x-y,\xi>} \widehat{\phi}_k(\xi) d\xi \Big| \frac{1}{(1+|x-z|)^{2d}} dz.$$

for any $M > 0$. If $|x-y| \leq 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \Big| \int_{|\xi|\sim 2^k} (I-\triangle_z)^M a(z,\xi) e^{2\pi i<x-y,\xi>} \widehat{\phi}_k(\xi) d\xi \Big| \\ \lesssim & \int_{|\xi|\sim 2^k} \big(1+|\xi|\big)^{m+2\rho M} d\xi \\ \lesssim & \ 2^{k(m+2\rho M+d)}. \end{aligned}$$

If $|x-y| > 1$, then do integration by part in ξ-variable as we did to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \Big| \int_{|\xi|\sim 2^k} (I-\triangle_z)^M a(z,\xi) e^{2\pi i<x-y,\xi>} \widehat{\phi}_k(\xi) d\xi \Big| \\ \lesssim_{N,M} & \ \frac{1}{|x-y|^N} \int_{|\xi|\sim 2^k} \big(1+|\xi|\big)^{m-\rho N+2\rho M} d\xi \\ \lesssim_{N,M} & \ 2^{k(m-\rho N+2\rho M+d)} \frac{1}{|x-y|^N}. \end{aligned}$$

These yield (3.9) by choosing M and N sufficiently large.

Since $\widehat{T_{a_k} f}$ is supported in $\{|\eta| \leq 2^{k+4}\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Big\| \sum_{k=10}^{\infty} T_{a_k} f \Big\|_{F_p^{0,t}} &\leq \Big\| \Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \big(\sum_{k=10}^{\infty} |\phi_j * T_{a_k}(f * \widetilde{\phi}_k)| \big)^t \Big)^{1/t} \Big\|_{L^p} \\ &\lesssim \Big\| \Big(\sum_{j=0}^{13} \big(\sum_{k=10}^{\infty} |\phi_j * T_{a_k}(f * \widetilde{\phi}_k)| \big)^t \Big)^{1/t} \Big\|_{L^p} \qquad (3.10) \\ &\quad + \Big\| \Big(\sum_{j=14}^{\infty} \big(\sum_{k=j-4}^{\infty} |\phi_j * T_{a_k}(f * \widetilde{\phi}_k)| \big)^t \Big)^{1/t} \Big\|_{L^p}. \qquad (3.11) \end{aligned}$$

Let $\sigma > \max\{d/p, d/t\}$ and choose $N > \sigma$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\phi_j * T_{a_k}(f * \widetilde{\phi}_k)(x)\right| &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\phi_j(x-z)||K_k(z,y)||f*\widetilde{\phi}_k(y)|dydz \\ &\lesssim \mathcal{M}_{\sigma,2^k}(f*\widetilde{\phi}_k)(x)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\left(1+2^k|x-y|\right)^{\sigma}\left|\phi_j(x-z)\right|\left|K_k(z,y)\right|dydz \\ &\lesssim 2^{-k(J-\sigma)}\mathcal{M}_{\sigma,2^k}(f*\widetilde{\phi}_k)(x)\end{aligned}$$

by the size estimate (3.9).

Thus for $\epsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}(3.10)\quad &\lesssim \Big\| \sum_{k=10}^{\infty} 2^{-k(J-\sigma)}\mathcal{M}_{\sigma,2^k}(f*\widetilde{\phi}_k)\Big\|_{L^p} \\ &\lesssim \Big\|\Big(\sum_{k=10}^{\infty} 2^{-kt(J-\sigma-\epsilon)}\left(\mathcal{M}_{\sigma,2^k}(f*\widetilde{\phi}_k)\right)^t\Big)^{1/t}\Big\|_{L^p} \\ &\lesssim \Big\|\Big(\sum_{k=10}^{\infty} 2^{-kt(J-\sigma-\epsilon)}\left|f*\widetilde{\phi}_k\right|^t\Big)^{1/t}\Big\|_{L^p} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{F_p^{-(J-\sigma-\epsilon),t}}\end{aligned}$$

by (2.4) and (2.5). Similarly we also get

$$(3.11)\quad \lesssim \|f\|_{F_p^{-(J-\sigma-\epsilon),t}}.$$

(3.4) follows from the choice of J satisfying

$$-(J-\sigma-\epsilon) < s.$$

3.4. **Boundedness of $T^{(3)}$.** We write a symbol $a^{(3)} \in \mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}$ as

$$a^{(3)}(x,\xi) = \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} b_k(x,\xi)$$

where

$$b_k(x,\xi) = \sum_{j=0}^{k-3} a_{j,k}(x,\xi).$$

Observe that since the Fourier transform of $T_{b_k}u$ is supported in $\{\xi : 2^{k-2} \leq |\xi| \leq 2^{k+2}\}$, we get for $0 < r < \infty$

$$\|T_{b_k}u\|_{L^r} \lesssim \|T_{b_k}u\|_{h^r}.$$

In addition,

$$b_k(x,\xi) = \Big(\sum_{j=0}^{k-3}\phi_j\Big) * a(\cdot,\xi)(x)$$

is a $\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}$ symbol with a constant which is independent of k, and thus for $u \in S'(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\|T_{b_k}u\|_{h^r} \leq C_r 2^{k\left(d(1-\rho)(|1/r-1/2|-|1/p-1/2|)\right)}\|\phi_k * u\|_{h^r}$$

by (2.2), which implies

$$(3.12)\qquad \|T_{b_k}u\|_{L^r} \lesssim C_r 2^{k\left(d(1-\rho)(|1/r-1/2|-|1/p-1/2|)\right)}\|\phi_k * u\|_{h^r}.$$

By the same reasoning as (3.5), we have

$$\|T^{(3)}f\|_{F_p^{0,t}} \lesssim \Big\|\Big(\sum_{k=3}^{\infty}|T_{b_k}f|^t\Big)^{1/t}\Big\|_{L^p}.$$

Therefore in order to conclude the proof of Theorem 1.1 it is enough to show that

$$\Big\|\Big(\sum_{k=3}^{\infty}|T_{b_k}f|^t\Big)^{1/t}\Big\|_{L^p} \lesssim \|f\|_{F_p^{0,q}}. \tag{3.13}$$

We shall study just the cases $0<p\le 1$ and $2<p<\infty$. Then since the adjoint operator $(T_a)^*$ is also in $Op\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}$ the case $1<p<2$ can be derived via duality. For $1<p<2$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T_af\|_{F_p^{0,p}} &= \big\|\phi_k * T_af\big\|_{L^p(l^p)}\\
&= \sup_{\|g_k\|_{L^{p'}(l^{p'})}\le 1}\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\phi_k * T_af(x)g_k(x)dx\Big|\\
&= \sup_{\|g_k\|_{L^{p'}(l^{p'})}\le 1}\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\phi_j * f(x)\widetilde{\phi}_j * \big(T_a^*(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\phi_k * g_k)\big)(x)dx\Big|\\
&\lesssim \|f\|_{F_p^{0,\infty}}\sup_{\|g_k\|_{L^{p'}(l^{p'})}\le 1}\Big\|T_a^*\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\phi_j * g_j\Big)\Big\|_{F_{p'}^{0,1}}\\
&\lesssim \|f\|_{F_p^{0,\infty}}\sup_{\|g_k\|_{L^{p'}(l^{p'})}\le 1}\Big\|\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\phi_k * g_k\Big\|_{F_{p'}^{0,p'}}\\
&\le \|f\|_{F_p^{0,\infty}}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds due to (2.3). Here everything makes sense and we may use (2.3) because the infinite sum of $\phi_k * g_k$ belongs to S' due to Lemma 3.1 with the estimate

$$\Big\|\Big(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}|\phi_k * g_k|^{p'}\Big)^{1/p'}\Big\|_{L^{p'}} \le \|g_k\|_{L^{p'}(l^{p'})} \le 1.$$

3.5. **Proof of (3.13); the case $0<p\le 1$.** We need to prove (3.13) with $t=p$ and $q=\infty$. In [19] Päivärinta and Somersalo use the atomic decomposition of the local hardy space for $0<p\le 1$. It is therefore natural to use an adaption of the atomic decomposition of Triebel-Lizorkin spaces. Alternatively, one can characterize Triebel-Lizorkin spaces $F_p^{s,q}$ with the associated sequence spaces $f_p^{s,q}$ via the Frazier and Jawerth φ-transform, and then use atomic decomposition for the sequence spaces. We follow the latter approach and recall definitions.

Definition 1. Let $0<p\le 1$, $0<q\le\infty$, and $s\in\mathbb{R}$. A sequence of complex numbers $r=\{r_Q\}_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{D}\\ l(Q)\le 1}}$ is called an ∞-atom for $f_p^{s,q}$ if there exists a dyadic cube Q_0 such that

$$r_Q = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad Q\not\subset Q_0$$

and

$$\big\|g^{s,q}(r)\big\|_{L^\infty} \le |Q_0|^{-1/p}. \tag{3.14}$$

The following atomic decomposition of $f_p^{s,q}$ substitutes the atomic decomposition of h^p.

Lemma 3.3. [10], [12] *Suppose $0 < p \le 1$, $p \le q \le \infty$, and $b = \{b_Q\}_{Q\in\mathcal{D}, l(Q)\le 1} \in f_p^{s,q}$. Then there exist $C_{d,p,q} > 0$, a sequence of scalars $\{\lambda_j\}$, and a sequence of ∞-atoms $r_j = \{r_{j,Q}\}_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{D}\\ l(Q)\le 1}}$ for $f_p^{s,q}$ such that*

$$b = \{b_Q\} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \{r_{j,Q}\} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j r_j$$

and such that

$$\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_j|^p\Big)^{1/p} \le C_{d,p,q} \big\|b\big\|_{f_p^{s,q}}.$$

Moreoever,

$$\big\|b\big\|_{f_p^{s,q}} \approx \inf\Big\{\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_j|^p\Big)^{1/p} : s = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j r_j,\ r_j \text{ is an } \infty\text{-atom for } f_p^{s,q}\Big\}.$$

By (2.6) and Lemma 3.3, $f \in F_p^{0,\infty}$ can be decomposed with $\{b_Q\}_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{D}\\ l(Q)\le 1}} \in f_p^{0,\infty}$ and there exist a sequence of scalars $\{\lambda_j\}$ and a sequence of ∞-atoms $\{r_{j,Q}\}$ for $f_p^{0,\infty}$ such that

$$f(x) = \sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{D}\\ l(Q)\le 1}} b_Q \vartheta^Q(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{D}\\ l(Q)\le 1}} r_{j,Q}\vartheta^Q(x).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\big\|T^{(3)}f\big\|_{F_p^{0,p}} &\lesssim \Big\|\big(\sum_{k=3}^{\infty} |T_{b_k} f|^p\big)^{1/p}\Big\|_{L^p} \\
&= \Big\|\Big(\sum_{k=3}^{\infty}\Big|\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j T_{b_k}\big(\sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{D}_k\\ l(Q)\le 1}} r_{j,Q}\vartheta^Q\big)\Big|^p\Big)^{1/p}\Big\|_{L^p} \\
&\le \Big[\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Big(\sum_{k=3}^{\infty}\big(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}|\lambda_j|^p \big|T_{b_k}\big(\sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{D}_k\\ l(Q)\le 1}} r_{j,Q}\vartheta^Q\big)\big|^p\big)\Big)dx\Big]^{1/p} \\
&= \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}|\lambda_j|^p \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\sum_{k=3}^{\infty}\big|T_{b_k}\big(\sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{D}_k\\ l(Q)\le 1}} r_{j,Q}\vartheta^Q\big)\big|^p dx\Big)^{1/p} \\
&\lesssim \big(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}|\lambda_j|^p\big)^{1/p} \sup_j\Big\{\Big(\sum_{k=3}^{\infty}\big\|T_{b_k}\big(\sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{D}_k\\ l(Q)\le 1}} r_{j,Q}\vartheta^Q\big)\big\|_{L^p}^p\Big)^{1/p}\Big\} \qquad (3.15)
\end{aligned}$$

by using $l^p \subset l^1$. Since

$$\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}|\lambda_j|^p\Big)^{1/p} \lesssim \|f\|_{F_p^{0,\infty}},$$

it is sufficient to show the supremum in (3.15) is bounded by a constant.

Let Q_0 be any dyadic cubes with side length $2^{-\mu}$ and r_Q be an ∞-atom for $f_p^{0,\infty}$ with Q_0 and define

$$R_{Q_0,k}(x) = \sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{D}_k, Q\subset Q_0\\ l(Q)\le 1}} r_Q \vartheta^Q(x).$$

Then we obtain the desired result by showing

$$\Big(\sum_{k=3}^{\infty}\|T_{b_k}R_{Q_0,k}\|_{L^p}^p\Big)^{1/p}\lesssim 1 \quad \text{uniformly in } Q_0. \tag{3.16}$$

Note that

$$|r_Q|\le |Q|^{1/2}|Q_0|^{-1/p} \tag{3.17}$$

by (3.14).

Let Q_0^* be a dilate of Q_0 by a factor of 10 and ${Q_0}^{**}$ by a factor of $100\sqrt{d}$. Furthermore denote by Q_0^ρ dilates of Q_0 with side $10l(Q_0)^\rho$, by $\widetilde{Q_0^\rho}$ with side $100\sqrt{d}l(Q_0)^\rho$.

We consider first the case $l(Q_0)\le 2^{-3}$ (i.e. $\mu\ge 3$).

The condition $Q\subset Q_0$ in the definition of $R_{Q_0,k}$ ensures that $R_{Q_0,k}$ vanishes unless $\mu\le k$. Hence the summation is taken over $k\ge\mu$ in (3.16). For each k we split the range of the integral into two parts, $\widetilde{Q_0^\rho}$ and $(\widetilde{Q_0^\rho})^c$.

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big(\sum_{k=3}^{\infty}\|T_{b_k}R_{Q_0,k}\|_{L^p}^p\Big)^{1/p}\\ \lesssim\ &\Big(\sum_{k=\mu}^{\infty}\|T_{b_k}R_{Q_0,k}\|_{L^p(\widetilde{Q_0^\rho})}^p\Big)^{1/p}+\Big(\sum_{k=\mu}^{\infty}\|T_{b_k}R_{Q_0,k}\|_{L^p(\widetilde{Q_0^\rho}^c)}^p\Big)^{1/p}.\end{aligned}$$

For the term corresponding to $\widetilde{Q_0^\rho}$, we use Hölder's inequality, (3.12), (2.7), and (3.17) to obtain for $p<r$

$$\begin{aligned}&\|T_{b_k}R_{Q_0,k}\|_{L^p(\widetilde{Q_0^\rho})}\\ \le\ &|\widetilde{Q_0^\rho}|^{1/p-1/r}\|T_{b_k}R_{Q_0,k}\|_{L^r}\\ \lesssim\ &2^{-\mu\rho d(1/p-1/r)}2^{-kd(1-\rho)(1/p-1/r)}\|R_{Q_0,k}\|_{h^r}\\ \lesssim\ &2^{-\mu\rho d(1/p-1/r)}2^{-kd(1-\rho)(1/p-1/r)}\Big\|\Big(\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}_k,Q\subset Q_0}(|r_Q||Q|^{-1/2}\chi_Q)^2\Big)^{1/2}\Big\|_{L^r}\\ \le\ &2^{\mu d(1-\rho)(1/p-1/r)}2^{-kd(1-\rho)(1/p-1/r)}\end{aligned}$$

and this gives

$$\Big(\sum_{k=\mu}^{\infty}\|T_{b_k}R_{Q_0,k}\|_{L^p(\widetilde{Q_0^\rho})}^p\Big)^{1/p}\ \lesssim\ 1$$

uniformly in μ.

For the latter one we split it into

$$\Big(\sum_{k=\mu}^{\infty}\|T_{b_k}(\chi_{(Q_0^*)^c}R_{Q_0,k})\|_{L^p(\widetilde{Q_0^\rho}^c)}^p\Big)^{1/p} \tag{3.18}$$

and

$$\Big(\sum_{k=\mu}^{\infty}\|T_{b_k}(\chi_{Q_0^*}R_{Q_0,k})\|_{L^p(\widetilde{Q_0^\rho}^c)}^p\Big)^{1/p} \tag{3.19}$$

and our claim is that each part can be controlled by a constant independent of μ.

By applying (3.12) we write

$$(3.18)\lesssim\Big(\sum_{k=\mu}^{\infty}\|\phi_k*(\chi_{(Q_0^*)^c}R_{Q_0,k})\|_{h^p}^p\Big)^{1/p}$$

and the Fourier support of ϕ_k gives the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}&\big\|\phi_k * \big(\chi_{(Q_0^*)^c} R_{Q_0,k}\big)\big\|_{h^p}\\ \lesssim\ & \big\|\phi_k^{(-1)} * \big(\chi_{(Q_0^*)^c} R_{Q_0,k}\big)\big\|_{L^p} + \big\|\phi_k^{(0)} * \big(\chi_{(Q_0^*)^c} R_{Q_0,k}\big)\big\|_{L^p} + \big\|\phi_k^{(1)} * \big(\chi_{(Q_0^*)^c} R_{Q_0,k}\big)\big\|_{L^p}\end{aligned}$$

where $\phi_k^{(-1)} = \phi_{k-1} * \phi_k$, $\phi_k^{(0)} = \phi_k * \phi_k$, and $\phi_k^{(1)} = \phi_{k+1} * \phi_k$.

For each $j \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\big\|\phi_k^{(j)} * \big(\chi_{(Q_0^*)^c} R_{Q_0,k}\big)\big\|_{L^p}^p\\ \le\ & \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Big(\int_{y\in(Q_0^*)^c} |\phi_k^{(j)}(x-y)| \sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{D}_k\\ Q\subset Q_0}} |r_Q||\vartheta^Q(y)| dy \Big)^p dx\\ \lesssim\ & 2^{-kp(N-d/2)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Big(\int_{y\in(Q_0^*)^c} |\phi_k^{(j)}(x-y)| \sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{D}_k\\ Q\subset Q_0}} \frac{|r_Q|}{|y-x_Q|^N} dy \Big)^p dx\\ \le\ & 2^{-kp(N-d/2)} \Big(\sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{D}_k\\ Q\subset Q_0}} |r_Q| \Big)^p \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Big(\int_{y\in(Q_0^*)^c} \frac{|\phi_k^{(j)}(x-y)|}{|y-c_{Q_0}|^N} dy \Big)^p dx\\ \le\ & 2^{-kp(N-d)} 2^{\mu dp(1/p-1)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Big(\int_{y\in(Q_0^*)^c} \frac{|\phi_k^{(j)}(x-y)|}{|y-c_{Q_0}|^N} dy \Big)^p dx\\ \lesssim\ & 2^{-kp(N-2d+d/p)} 2^{\mu dp(1/p-1)} \Big(\int_{y\in(Q_0^*)^c} \frac{1}{|y-c_{Q_0}|^N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (1+2^k|x-c_{Q_0}|)^{L/p} |\phi_k^{(j)}(x-y)| dx dy \Big)^p\\ \lesssim\ & 2^{-kp(N-2d+d/p-L/p)} 2^{\mu dp(1/p-1)} \Big(\int_{y\in(Q_0^*)^c} \frac{1}{|y-c_{Q_0}|^{N-L/p}} dy \Big)^p\\ \lesssim\ & 2^{-kp(N-2d+d/p-L/p)} 2^{\mu dp(1/p-1)} 2^{\mu p(N-L/p-d)}\end{aligned}$$

for $L > d(1-p)$ and $N - L/p > d$. Here the third inequality follows from the fact that

$$|y - x_Q| \gtrsim |y - c_{Q_0}|$$

for $y \in (Q_0^*)^c$ and $Q \subset Q_0$, and the fourth one holds because of (3.17).

Finally we obtain

$$\lesssim\ 1. \tag{3.18}$$

For (3.19) let $K_k(x,y)$ be the kernel of T_{b_k} and write

$$\big\|T_{b_k}(\chi_{Q_0^*} R_{Q_0,k})\big\|_{L^p(\widetilde{Q_0^\rho}^c)} \le \Big[\int_{\widetilde{Q_0^\rho}^c} \Big(\int_{Q_0^*} \big|K(x,y)\big| |R_{Q_0,k}(y)| dy \Big)^p dx \Big]^{1/p}.$$

By using Hölder's inequality and (3.17) it is less than

$$\begin{aligned}& 2^{\mu\rho(L/p-d/p+d)} \|R_{Q_0,k}\|_{L^1} \sup_{y\in Q_0^*} \int_{\widetilde{Q_0^\rho}^c} |x-y|^{L/p} |K_k(x,y)| dx\\ \le\ & 2^{\mu\rho L/p} 2^{\mu d(1-\rho)(1/p-1)} \sup_{y\in Q_0^*} \int_{\widetilde{Q_0^\rho}^c} |x-y|^{L/p} |K_k(x,y)| dx\end{aligned}$$

for $L > d(1-p)$. Here we select $L > d(1-p)$ which makes L/p become an integer. It suffices to show

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{y\in Q_0^*} \int_{\widetilde{Q_0^\rho}^c} |x-y|^{L/p} |K_k(x,y)| dx\\ \lesssim\ & 2^{-k\rho L/p} 2^{-kd(1-\rho)(1/p-1)} 2^{\epsilon(\mu-k)}\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$. Let $y \in Q_0^*$. By Schwarz's inequality and the fact that $|x - c_{Q_0}| \lesssim |x - y|$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\left(\widetilde{Q_0^\rho}\right)^c} |x-y|^{L/p} \big|K_k(x,y)\big| dx \\ \lesssim\ & 2^{\mu\rho(|\alpha|-d/2)} \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big|(x-y)^{\alpha+\beta} K_k(x,y)\big|^2 dx \Big)^{1/2}\end{aligned}$$

for a multi-index β with $|\beta| = L/p$. Define

$$c_k(y,\eta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_k(x+y,y) e^{-2\pi i <x,\eta>} dx.$$

Then by Plancherel's theorem

$$\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big|(x-y)^{\alpha+\beta} K_k(x,y)\big|^2 dx \Big)^{1/2} = \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big|\partial_\eta^{\alpha+\beta} c_k(y,\eta)\big|^2 d\eta \Big)^{1/2}$$

Observe that $\overline{c_k(y,\eta)}$ can be interpreted as a symbol corresponding to the adjoint operator of T_{b_k} and therefore c_k belongs to $\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}$(See Appendix for more details). Furthermore η lives in the annulus $\{\eta : 2^{k-2} \le |\eta| \le 2^{k+2}\}$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\left(\widetilde{Q_0^\rho}\right)^c} |x-y|^{L/p} \big|K_k(x,y)\big| dx \\ \lesssim\ & 2^{-k\rho L/p} 2^{-kd(1-\rho)(1/p-1)} 2^{\rho(|\alpha|-d/2)(\mu-k)},\end{aligned}$$

which concludes (3.20).

Now assume $l(Q_0) > 2^{-3}$(i.e. $\mu < 3$). In this case it's better to use the range $k \ge 3$ in our summations since $\mu \le 2$. Then by repeating the above process we see that

$$\Big(\sum_{k=3}^\infty \big\| T_{b_k} R_{Q_0,k} \big\|^p_{L^p(Q_0^{**})} \Big)^{1/p} \lesssim 1,$$

$$\Big(\sum_{k=3}^\infty \big\| T_{b_k} (\chi_{(Q_0^*)^c} R_{Q_0,k}) \big\|^p_{L^p((Q_0^{**})^c)} \Big)^{1/p} \lesssim 1,$$

and

$$\Big(\sum_{k=3}^\infty \big\| T_{b_k} (\chi_{Q_0^*} R_{Q_0,k}) \big\|^p_{L^p((Q_0^{**})^c)} \Big)^{1/p} \lesssim 1$$

uniformly in $\mu \le 2$. This completes the proof of the case $0 < p \le 1$ in Theorem 1.1.

3.6. **Proof of (3.13); the case $2 < p < \infty$.** Suppose $2 < p < \infty$ and we will prove (3.13) with $0 < t \le \infty$ and $q = p$. In [21] the boundedness of (1.6) from $F_p^{0,p}$ into $F_p^{0,t}$ was established as a corollary of the following result. Let $0 < a < d$, $\epsilon > 0$ and $1 < p_0 < p < \infty$. Consider operators T_k defined on $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by

$$T_k f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_k(x,y) f(y) dy,$$

where each K_k is a continuous and bounded kernel. Assume T_k satisfy

$$\sup_{k>0} 2^{ka/p} \|T_k\|_{L^p \to L^p} \le A \tag{3.21}$$

and

$$\sup_{k>0} 2^{ka/p_0} \|T_k\|_{L^{p_0} \to L^{p_0}} \le B_0. \tag{3.22}$$

Furthermore let $\Gamma \geq 1$ and assume that for each cube Q there is a measurable set $\mathcal{E}_Q$ so that

$$|\mathcal{E}_Q| \leq \Gamma \max\{|Q|^{1-a/d}, |Q|\},$$

and for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and every cube Q with $2^k l(Q) \geq 1$,

$$\sup_{x\in Q} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathcal{E}_Q} |K_k(x,y)|dy \leq B_1 \max\left\{(2^k l(Q))^{-\epsilon}, 2^{-k\epsilon}\right\}. \tag{3.23}$$

Let $\mathcal{B} = B_0^{p_0/p}(A\Gamma^{1/p} + B_1)^{1-p_0/p}$. Then there is a $C > 0$ such that

$$\Big\| \Big(\sum_k 2^{kar/p} |\phi_k * T_k f_k|^q \Big)^{1/q} \Big\|_{L^p} \leq CA \Big[\log(3 + \frac{\mathcal{B}}{A}) \Big]^{1/q-1/p} \Big(\sum_k \|f_k\|_{L^p}^p \Big)^{1/p}.$$

As we did in [21], set $a = (1-\rho)d$, and for cube Q with $l(Q) < 1$ choose $\mathcal{E}_Q$ to be the cube with the same center, but with diameter $Cl(Q)^\rho$ for large C. If $l(Q) \geq 1$, $\mathcal{E}_Q$ is just a dilate of Q by a factor of large constant C. Let

$$\widetilde{b_k}(x,\xi) := (1+|\xi|^2)^{-d(1-\rho)/(2p)} b_k(x,\xi) \tag{3.24}$$

and define $T_k := T_{\widetilde{b_k}}$. Then operators T_k obviously satisfy (3.21) and (3.22) with $p_0 = 2$. Thus it suffices to show that (3.23) still holds with our kernel

$$K_k(x,y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \widetilde{b_k}(x,\xi) e^{2\pi i <x-y,\xi>} d\xi. \tag{3.25}$$

Fix $x \in Q$. Then for $y \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathcal{E}_Q$, $|x-y| \gtrsim l(\mathcal{E}_Q)$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathcal{E}_Q} |K_k(x,y)|dy &\leq \int_{|x-y|\gtrsim l(\mathcal{E}_Q)} |K_k(x,y)|dy \\
&\lesssim l(\mathcal{E}_Q)^{-|\alpha|+d/2} \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |(x-y)^\alpha K_k(x,y)|^2 dy \Big)^{1/2} \\
&= l(\mathcal{E}_Q)^{-|\alpha|+d/2} \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\partial_\xi^\alpha \widetilde{b_k}(x,\xi)|^2 d\xi \Big)^{1/2}
\end{aligned}$$

for any multi-indices α with $|\alpha| > d/2$ by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Plancherel's theorem. Since $\widetilde{b_k} \in S^{-d(1-\rho)/2}_{\rho,\rho}$, this is bounded by

$$\big(2^{k\rho} l(\mathcal{E}_Q)\big)^{-|\alpha|+d/2}.$$

By choosing α satisfying $\rho(|\alpha| - d/2) > \epsilon$, we can get (3.23) and it concludes the proof of (3.13).

4. **The proof of Theorem 1.2**

Theorem 1.2 can be proved in a similar way. The first one is simply from (2.2), Hölder's inequality, and the embedding theorem $l^{p_1} \subset l^{p_2}$ when $p_1 \leq p_2$. By repeating the process in Section 3, (3.3) and (3.4) hold if F-spaces are replaced by B-spaces, and the boundedness of $T^{(3)}$ on B-spaces follows just from (3.12).

5. **Sharpness of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2**

In this section we shall show that the hypothesis

$$m - s_1 + s_2 \leq -d(1-\rho)\big|1/2 - 1/p\big|$$

is optimal and when the equality holds, the necessity of the condition on q and t in Theorem 1.1. We may assume $s_1 = s_2 = 0$.

5.1. **Sharpness of Theorem 1.1.** Recall that h^p boundedness of $OpS^m_{\rho,\rho}$ does not hold without the assumption (1.6). (1.5) is one example of a pseudo-differential operator that is not bounded in h^p for $0 < p < \infty$ if

$$m > -d(1-\rho)\big|1/2 - 1/p\big|.$$

See [6], [13], [26] for $1 < p < \infty$ and [18] for $0 < p \le 1$. This example further extends to $0 < q, t \le \infty$. There exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$m - 2\epsilon > -d(1-\rho)\big|1/2 - 1/p\big|.$$

Then choose $a \in \mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}$ and $f \in F^{\epsilon,2}_p$ such that

$$\|f\|_{F^{\epsilon,2}_p} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \big\|T_a f\big\|_{F^{-\epsilon,2}_p} = \infty.$$

By $F^{\epsilon,2}_p \hookrightarrow F^{0,q}_p$ and $F^{0,t}_p \hookrightarrow F^{-\epsilon,2}_p$, we have

$$\|f\|_{F^{0,q}_p} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \big\|T_a f\big\|_{F^{0,t}_p} = \infty. \tag{5.1}$$

Now suppose

$$m = -d(1-\rho)\big|1/2 - 1/p\big|$$

and consider the condition of q and t. Christ and Seeger [4] show that (1.5) is unbounded in $F^{0,q}_p$ provided that $0 < q < p \le 2$ with

$$m = -d(1-\rho)\big(1/p - 1/2\big).$$

Theorem 5.1. [4] *Let $0 < q < p \le 2$, $0 < \rho < 1$, $m = -d(1-\rho)\big(1/p - 1/2\big)$. Then, for $R \ge 2$,*

$$\sup\big\{\big\|c_{m,\rho}(D)f\big\|_{F^{0,q}_p} : \|f\|_{F^{0,q}_p} \le 1, f \in \mathcal{E}(R)\big\} \approx (\log R)^{1/q-1/p}$$

where $\mathcal{E}(R)$ is the space of all (smooth) distributions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ whose Fourier transforms are supported in $\{\xi : |\xi| \le R\}$.

The case " $\lesssim$ " is immediate by Hölder's inequality and the embedding $l^q \subset l^p$. They use a randomization technique to show the existence of $f \in \mathcal{E}(R)$ such that

$$\|f\|_{F^{0,q}_p} \lesssim 1$$

and

$$\|c_{m,\rho}(D)f\|_{F^{0,q}_p} \gtrsim (\log R)^{1/q-1/p},$$

and this idea can be applied to our cases. For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ let $\mathcal{Q}(k)$ be the set of all dyadic cubes of side length 2^{-k} in $[0,1]^d$ and $\mathcal{Q} = \bigcup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \mathcal{Q}(k)$. Let Ω be a probability space with probability measure μ. Let $\{\theta_Q\}$ be a family of independent random variables indexed by $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, each of which takes the value 1 with probability $2^{-kd(1-\rho)}$ and the value 0 with probability $1 - 2^{-kd(1-\rho)}$ for $Q \in \mathcal{Q}(k)$. Let η be in $\mathcal{E}(2)$ such that $\widehat{\eta}$ vanishes identically in a neighborhood of the origin and $\widehat{\eta}(\xi) = 1$ if $2^{-1/2} \le |\xi| \le 2^{1/2}$ and let $\widetilde{\eta}$ be in $\mathcal{E}(2)$ whose Fourier transform equals 1 on the support of $\widehat{\eta}$. Define for $k \ge 1$ the operator S_k by

$$\widehat{S_k f}(\xi) = 2^{mk} e^{2\pi i|\xi|^{1-\rho}} \widehat{\eta}(2^{-k}\xi)\widehat{f}(\xi) \tag{5.2}$$

and

$$f^{k,w}(x) = 2^{kd(1-\rho)/p} \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}(k)} \theta_Q(w)\widetilde{\eta}(2^k(x - c_Q)).$$

According to [4],

$$\Big(\int_\Omega \Big\|\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{L}|f^{k,w|q}\Big)^{1/q}\Big\|_{L^p}^p d\mu(w)\Big)^{1/p} \lesssim L^{1/p}$$

for any $0<q\le\infty$, and

$$\Big(\int_\Omega \Big\|(\sum_{k=1}^{L}|S_k f^{k,w}|^t)^{1/t}\Big\|_{L^p}^p d\mu(w)\Big)^{1/p} \gtrsim L^{1/t}$$

for $0<t<p\le 2$. This implies that

$$\sup\{\big\|C_{m,\rho}(D)f\big\|_{F_p^{0,t}} : \|f\|_{F_p^{0,q}}\le 1, f\in\mathcal{E}(R)\} \gtrsim (\log R)^{1/t-1/p}. \tag{5.3}$$

for $0<t<p$ and $0<q\le\infty$, which proves the necessity of the condition $p\le t$.

Suppose $2\le p<\infty$ and $p<q$. Let $p<r<\infty$. Note that the adjoint operator $\big(C_{m,\rho}(D)\big)^* = \overline{C_{m,\rho}}(D)$ has the same estimate like (5.3). Thus there exists $g\in\mathcal{E}(R)$ such that

$$\|g\|_{F_{p'}^{0,1}}\le 1$$

and

$$\big\|\overline{C_{m,\rho}}(D)g\big\|_{F_{p'}^{0,r'}} \gtrsim (\log R)^{1/r'-1/p'}.$$

Since for some constant $A>0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\big\|\overline{C_{m,\rho}}(D)g\big\|_{F_{p'}^{0,r'}} &= \big\|\overline{C_{m,\rho}}(D)(g*\phi_k)\big\|_{L^{p'}(l^{r'})}\\
&= \sup_{\|f_k\|_{L^p(l^r)}\le 1}\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\sum_{k=0}^{A\log R}\overline{C_{m,\rho}}(D)(g*\phi_k)(x)f_k(x)dx\Big|\\
&= \sup_{\|f_k\|_{L^p(l^r)}\le 1}\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\sum_{k=0}^{A\log R} g*\phi_k(x)C_{m,\rho}(D)(\widetilde{\phi_k}*f_k)(x)dx\Big|\\
&\le \sup_{\|f_k\|_{L^p(l^r)}\le 1}\Big\|\sup_{0\le k\le A\log R}\big|c_{m,\rho}(D)(\widetilde{\phi_k}*f_k)\big|\Big\|_{L^p},
\end{aligned}$$

there exists a sequence of functions $\{f_k\}$ in $L^p(l^r)$ such that

$$\|f_k\|_{L^p(l^r)}\le 1 \tag{5.4}$$

and

$$\Big\|\sup_{0\le k\le A\log R}\big|C_{m,\rho}(D)(\widetilde{\phi_k}*f_k)\big|\Big\|_{L^p} \gtrsim (\log R)^{1/p-1/r}. \tag{5.5}$$

Let

$$f(x)=\sum_{k=0}^{A\log R}\widetilde{\phi_k}*f_k(x).$$

Then clearly $f\in S'$ and

$$\|f\|_{F_p^{0,\infty}}\le\|f\|_{F_p^{0,r}}\lesssim 1$$

by (2.3) and (5.4). Moreover, since $\|C_{m,\rho}f\|_{F_p^{0,\infty}}$ is equivalent to the left side of (5.5), we have

$$\big\|C_{m,\rho}(D)f\big\|_{F_p^{0,\infty}} \gtrsim (\log R)^{1/p-1/r}.$$

We conclude that for $2\le p<q\le\infty$ and $0<t\le\infty$

$$\sup\{\big\|C_{m,\rho}(D)f\big\|_{F_p^{0,t}} : \|f\|_{F_p^{0,q}}\le 1, f\in\mathcal{E}(R^A)\} \gtrsim_\epsilon (\log R)^\epsilon \tag{5.6}$$

.with $0 < \epsilon < 1/p - 1/q$ (In fact, if $p < q < \infty$ then we can put $q = r$ and $\epsilon = 1/p - 1/q$).

(5.3) and (5.6) prove the necessity of the hypothesis $p \le t$ in Theorem 1.1 (3), and $q \le p$ in (4), respectively, and we obtain the necessity of the hypothesis $q \le 2 \le t$ in (2) by putting together both estimates.

5.2. **Sharpness of Theorem 1.2.** We need also (1.7) to get the result in Theorem 1.2. If (1.7) fails, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $m - 2\epsilon > -d(1-\rho)\big|1/2 - 1/p\big|$. Construct $a \in \mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}$ and $f \in F^{\epsilon,p}_p$ such that

$$\|f\|_{F^{\epsilon,p}_p} < \infty \text{ and } \big\|T_a f\big\|_{F^{-\epsilon,p}_p} = \infty.$$

Then by $B^{0,t}_p \hookrightarrow F^{-\epsilon,p}_p$ and $F^{\epsilon,p}_p \hookrightarrow B^{0,q}_p$, we have

$$\|f\|_{B^{0,q}_p} < \infty \text{ but } \big\|T_a f\big\|_{B^{0,q}_p} = \infty. \tag{5.7}$$

Now assume $m = -d(1-\rho)\big|1/p - 1/2\big|$ and prove the necessity of the hypothesis $q \le t$ in Theorem 1.2 (2). The argument we present is similar to one given above. We construct a function $g \in \mathcal{E}(R)$ such that for $q > t$

$$\|g\|_{B^{0,q}_p} \lesssim 1 \quad \text{uniformly in } R$$

and

$$\big\|c_{m.\rho}(D)g\big\|_{B^{0,t}_p} \gtrsim C_R$$

where C_R blows up to infinity as R increases.

Assume $0 < p \le 2$ and $m = -d(1-\rho)\big(1/p - 1/2\big)$. Let S_k be defined as (5.2) and $g_k(x) = k^{-1/t} 2^{kd/p} \eta(2^k x)$. Our claim is that

$$\Big(\sum_{k=10}^{L} \|g_k\|^q_{L^p} \Big)^{1/q} \lesssim 1 \tag{5.8}$$

for $q > t$, and

$$\Big(\sum_{k=10}^{L} \|S_k g_k\|^t_{L^p} \Big)^{1/t} \gtrsim (\log L)^{1/t}. \tag{5.9}$$

(5.8) is clear because

$$\|g_k\|_{L^p} \sim k^{-1/t}.$$

When K_k is the convolution kernel of S_k,

$$S_k g_k(x) = k^{-1/t} 2^{-kd(1-1/p)} 2^{km} K_k(x).$$

By the method of stationary phase as in [4], for a suitable $\epsilon_1 > 0$ there is the uniform estimate for large k

$$|K_k(x)| \ge 2^{kd(1+\rho)/2} \quad \text{if } (1-\epsilon_1)2^{-k\rho} \le |x| \le (1+\epsilon_1)2^{-k\rho}.$$

This gives

$$\big\|S_k g_k\big\|_{L^p} \gtrsim k^{-1/t},$$

which implies (5.9).

For $2 \le p < \infty$, we may choose a sequence of functions $\{f_k\}$ whose Fourier transform has a compact support in $\{\xi : |\xi| \sim 2^k\}$ such that

$$\|S_k(f_k)\|_{L^p} \gtrsim k^{-1/t} \gtrsim \|f_k\|_{L^p}$$

by using the fact that the dual space of $L^{p'}$ is L^p. Then (5.8) and (5.9) holds with f_k instead of g_k.

6. The case $p = \infty$

We give an extension of Theorem 1.1 and 1.2 to the case $p = \infty$, and as in [2] and [9] use the following definitions which are analogous to the characterizations of bmo via Carleson measures.

$$\|f\|_{F^{s,q}_\infty} = \big\|\phi_0 * f\big\|_{L^\infty} + \sup_{l(Q)<1} \Big(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q \sum_{k\geq -\log_2 l(Q)} \big(2^{sk}|\phi_k * f(x)|\big)^q dx\Big)^{1/q}$$

for $0 < q < \infty$ and

$$\|f\|_{F^{s,\infty}_\infty} = \big\|\phi_0 * f\big\|_{L^\infty} + \sup_{l(Q)<1}\sup_{k\geq -\log_2 l(Q)} \frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q 2^{sk}|\phi_k * f(x)|dx$$

where the supremum is taken over any dyadic cubes whose side length is less than 1. Then define $F^{s,q}_\infty$ to be the set of all $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\|f\|_{F^{s,q}_\infty} < \infty$ for $0 < q \leq \infty$. We use (1.3) as a definition of $B^{s,q}_\infty$ by replacing L^p by L^∞. Then as shown in [9] the spaces are independent of the choice $\Phi = \{\widehat{\phi_k}\}_k$, and thus we now fix Φ. Note that

$$bmo \approx F^{0,2}_\infty$$

and

$$F^{s,\infty}_\infty \approx B^{s,\infty}_\infty$$

(We refer the reader to [2] and [9] for more detail).

Theorem 6.1. *Let $0 < \rho < 1$, $0 < q \leq \infty$, $0 < t \leq \infty$, and $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose $m \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies* (1.7) *and $a \in \mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}$. Then T_a maps $F^{s_1,q}_\infty$ into $F^{s_2,t}_\infty$.*

Theorem 6.2. *Let $0 < \rho < 1$, $0 < q, t \leq \infty$, and $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose $m \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies (1.7) and $a \in \mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}$. Then T_a maps $B^{s_1,q}_\infty$ into $B^{s_2,t}_\infty$ if the following cases;*

(1) if $m - s_1 + s_2 < -d(1-\rho)/2$;
(2) if $q \leq t$ and $m - s_1 + s_2 = -d(1-\rho)/2$.

Unlike the case $1 < p < \infty$ we do not have L^∞ boundedness of the operator. Instead, Fefferman [6] proved that T_a maps L^∞ into BMO and the key idea of the proof is the following L^∞ estimates with an additional support condition of a. For any $a \in \mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta}$ and $r > 0$, if $a(x,\cdot)$ is supported in $\{\xi : r/2 \leq |\xi| \leq 2r\}$ and $m = -d(1-\rho)/2$, then we have

$$\big\|T_a f\big\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|a\|_{\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta}} \|f\|_{L^\infty} \tag{6.1}$$

where

$$\|a\|_{\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta}} = \sup_{|\alpha|,|\beta|\leq d} \big|\partial^\alpha_\xi \partial^\beta_x a(x,\xi)\big|(1+|\xi|)^{-m+\rho|\alpha|-\delta|\beta|}.$$

Here the implicit constant is independent of r. Also if $a(x,\cdot)$ is supported in a ball of radius R centered at the origin for some constant $R > 0$, then there exists $C_R > 0$ such that

$$\big\|T_a f\big\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_R \|a\|_{\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta}} \|f\|_{L^\infty}. \tag{6.2}$$

Proof of Theorem 6.1. We may assume $s_1 = s_2 = 0$. Also we may assume $0 < q < 1$ because other cases follow by embedding theorem $F^{0,q_1}_\infty \hookrightarrow F^{0,q_2}_\infty$ for $q_1 < q_2$. Let $m = -d(1-\rho)/2$, and $f \in F^{0,\infty}_\infty$. Note that

$$\|T_a f\|_{F^{0,q}_\infty} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{10} \big\|\phi_k * T_a f\big\|_{L^\infty} + \sup_{l(Q)<1} \Big(\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q \sum_{k\geq 10-\log_2 l(Q)} |\phi_k * T_a f(x)|^q dx\Big)^{1/q}.$$

We consider just the supremum term and a similar method can be applied to the first one. We shall base the proof on the arguments in Section 3 and use same notations. Write

$$T_a f = T^{(1)} f + T^{(2)} f + T^{(3)} f$$

and it suffices to show that for fixed dyadic cube Q of side length $l(Q) < 1$,

$$\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q \sum_{k\ge 10-\log_2 l(Q)} \left|\phi_k * T^{(i)} f(x)\right|^q dx \lesssim \sup_k \|f_k\|_{L^\infty}^q \tag{6.3}$$

uniformly in Q for each $i = 1, 2, 3$, where $\widetilde{\phi}_k = \phi_{k-1} + \phi_k + \phi_{k+1}$ and $f_k = \widetilde{\phi}_k * f$.

First of all,

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q \sum_{k\ge 10-\log_2 l(Q)} \left|\phi_k * T^{(1)} f(x)\right|^q dx\\ \lesssim\ & \sum_{k\ge 10-\log_2 l(Q)} \sum_{j=k-2}^{k+2} \sum_{n=0}^{j-3} \|T_{a_{j,n}} f_n\|_{L^\infty}^q.\end{aligned}$$

By using the same argument to get (3.6) with $r = 1$ and $c^{(r,d)} = d + 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|T_{a_{j,n}} f_n\|_{L^\infty} &\lesssim 2^{k(m+(d+1)(1-\rho)+\rho N)-jN} \left\|\mathcal{M} f_n\right\|_{L^\infty}\\ &\le 2^{k(m+(d+1)(1-\rho)+\rho N)-jN} \sup_l \|f_l\|_{L^\infty}\end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

for sufficiently large N. This proves (6.3) when $i = 1$.

Now we deal with $T^{(2)}$. Break up this operator into two parts as (3.7). Then (6.1) and (6.2) yield the desired result for the finite sum. For the infinite sum, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q \sum_{k\ge 10-\log_2 l(Q)} \left|\phi_k * \Big(\sum_{n=10}^{\infty} T_{a_n} f\Big)(x)\right|^q dx\\ \lesssim\ & \sum_{k\ge 10-\log_2 l(Q)} \sum_{n=10}^{\infty} \left\|\phi_k * (T_{a_n} f_n)\right\|_{L^\infty}^q.\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $a_n(x,\xi) = \Phi_n * a(\cdot,\xi)(x)\widehat{\phi_n}(\xi)$ where $\Phi_n = \sum_{j=n-2}^{n+2} \phi_j$. From the support properties of $\widehat{\phi_k}$ and $\widehat{T_{a_n} f_n}$ it follows immediately that the summand vanishes unless $k \le n + 4$. Thus the last expression is bounded by a constant times

$$\sum_{k\ge 10-\log_2 l(Q)} \sum_{n=k-4}^{\infty} \left\|T_{a_n} f_n\right\|_{L^\infty}^q.$$

Our claim is that for any $J > 0$

$$\|T_{a_n} f_n\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim_J 2^{-Jn} \sup_l \|f_l\|_{L^\infty}, \tag{6.5}$$

which completes the proof for $T^{(2)}$. To see (6.5) we apply the size estimate (3.9), but it may not be true when we drop the hypothesis of compact support of $a(x,\xi)$ in x variable. Thus, first define $a^\tau(x,\xi)$ as (3.1) and let $a_n^\tau(x,\xi) := \Phi_n * a^\tau(\cdot,\xi)(x)\widehat{\phi_n}(\xi)$. When $K_n^\tau(x,y)$ is the kernel of $T_{a_n^\tau}$, then for any $J > 0$ and $N > 0$ we have

$$|K_n^\tau(x,y)| \lesssim_{J,N} 2^{-Jn} \frac{1}{(1+|x-y|)^N}$$

uniformly in τ. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\|T_{a_n^\tau} f_n\|_{L^\infty} &\leq \big\|f_n\big\|_{L^\infty} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|K_n^\tau(x,y)|dy\\ &\lesssim_J 2^{-Jn}\sup_l\|f_l\|_{L^\infty}\end{aligned}$$

and this estimate holds uniformly in τ. Then (6.5) follows from the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{\tau\to\infty}\big\|T_{a_n^\tau}f_n - T_{a_n}f_n\big\|_{L^\infty} &= \limsup_{\tau\to\infty}\sup_{|x|\geq\tau}|T_{a_n}f_n(x)|\\ &\lesssim_n \limsup_{\tau\to\infty}\tau^{-1}=0\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows by an integration by parts.

As in Section 3, $T^{(3)}f$ can be written as

$$T^{(3)}f=\sum_{n=3}^{\infty}T_{b_n}f$$

where $b_n(x,\xi)=\sum_{j=0}^{n-3}a_{j,n}(x,\xi)=\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{n-3}\phi_j\Big)*a(\cdot,\xi)(x)\widehat{\phi_n}(\xi)$. Due to the fact that the Fourier transform of $T_{b_n}f$ is supported in $\{\xi:2^{n-2}\leq|\xi|\leq 2^{n+2}\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q\sum_{k\geq 10-\log_2 l(Q)}\big|\phi_k*T^{(3)}f(x)\big|^q dx\\ \lesssim\ &\sum_{k\geq 10-\log_2 l(Q)}\sum_{n=k-2}^{k+2}\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q\big|\phi_k*(T_{b_n}f_n)(x)\big|^q dx.\end{aligned}$$

We consider only the case $n=k$ and other cases follow by the same way.

We apply Fefferman's method in [6]. Let Ψ be a bump function satisfying $0\leq\Psi\leq 10$, $\Psi\geq 1$ on $[-1/2,1/2]^d$, and $Supp(\widehat{\Psi})\subset\{\xi:|\xi|\leq 2^{-3}\}$. Define $\Psi_Q(x)=\Psi\big(l(Q)^{-\rho}(x-c_Q)\big)$ where c_Q is the center of cube Q. Then Ψ_Q has the properties $0\leq\Psi_Q\leq 10$, $\Psi_Q\geq 1$ on Q, $Supp(\widehat{\Psi_Q})\subset\{\xi:|\xi|\leq 2^{-3}l(Q)^{-\rho}\}$, and $\|\widehat{\Psi_Q}\|_{L^\infty}\lesssim l(Q)^{\rho d}$. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{k\geq 10-\log_2 l(Q)}\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q\big|\phi_k*(T_{b_k}f_k)(x)\big|^q dx\\ \leq\ &\sum_{k\geq 10-\log_2 l(Q)}\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q\big|\phi_k*(T_{b_k}f_k)(x)\Psi_Q(x)\big|^q dx\\ \lesssim\ &\sum_{k\geq 10-\log_2 l(Q)}\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q\big|\phi_k*(T_{b_k}f_k)(x)\Psi_Q(x)-\phi_k*\big(\Psi_Q T_{b_k}f_k\big)(x)\big|^q dx\\ &+\sum_{k\geq 10-\log_2 l(Q)}\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q\big|\phi_k*\big(\Psi_Q T_{b_k}f_k - T_{b_k}(f_k\Psi_Q)\big)(x)\big|^q dx\\ &+\sum_{k\geq 10-\log_2 l(Q)}\frac{1}{|Q|}\int_Q\big|\phi_k*\big(T_{b_k}(f_k\Psi_Q)\big)(x)\big|^q dx\\ :=\ &I+II+III.\end{aligned}$$

By elementary computation we obtain

$$\big\|\phi_k*(T_{b_k}f_k)\Psi_Q-\phi_k*\big(\Psi_Q T_{b_k}f_k\big)\big\|_\infty\lesssim 2^{-k}l(Q)^{-\rho}\|T_{b_k}f_k\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Furthermore, since $\|b_k\|_{\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}} \lesssim \|a\|_{\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}}$ uniformly in k

$$\|T_{b_k} f_k\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|a\|_{\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}} \sup_l \|f_l\|_{L^\infty} \tag{6.6}$$

by applying (6.1). Combining these two estimates and summing over $k \geq 10 - \log_2 l(Q)$, we get

$$I \lesssim \sup_l \|f_l\|^q_{L^\infty}.$$

For the second one, $\Psi_Q T_{b_k} f_k - T_{b_k}(f_k \Psi_Q)$ can be written in the form $T_{v_k} f_k$ where

$$v_k(x,\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \big(b_k(x,\xi) - b_k(x,\eta+\xi)\big)\widehat{\Psi_Q}(\eta) e^{2\pi i <x,\eta>} d\eta$$

is a symbol in $\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}$. Indeed,

$$\|v_k\|_{\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}} \lesssim 2^{-\rho k} l(Q)^{-\rho} \|a\|_{\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}}. \tag{6.7}$$

Combining (6.1) and (6.7),

$$\big\|\Psi_Q T_{b_k} f_k - T_{b_k}(f_k \Psi_Q)\big\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim 2^{-\rho k} l(Q)^{-\rho} \sup_l \|f_l\|_{L^\infty},$$

which establishes

$$II \lesssim \sup_l \|f_l\|^q_{L^\infty}.$$

By Hölder's inequality, Young's inequality, and (3.12),

$$\begin{aligned} III &\lesssim \sum_{k \geq 10-\log_2 l(Q)} \frac{1}{|Q|^{q/2}} \big\|T_{b_k}(f_k \Psi_Q)\big\|^q_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{|Q|^{q/2}} \sum_{k \geq 10-\log_2 l(Q)} 2^{-kdq(1-\rho)/2} \|f_k \Psi_Q\|^q_{L^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|Q|^{q/2}} \sup_l \|f_l\|^q_{L^\infty} \sum_{k \geq 10-\log_2 l(Q)} 2^{-kdq(1-\rho)/2} \|\Psi_Q\|^q_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \sup_l \|f_l\|^q_{L^\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 6.2. By (3.6) and (6.6), $T^{(1)}$ and $T^{(2)}$ map $B^{s_1,q}_\infty$ into $B^{s_2,t}_\infty$ for any $0 < q, t \leq \infty$. The boundedness of $T^{(3)}$ is immediately from (6.1) for both cases (1) and (2). □

6.1. **Sharpness.** For each $k = 10, 11, 12, \dots$ let $x^k = (2^k, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and define a Schwartz function g_k to satisfy

$$\widehat{g_k}(\xi) = \sigma_k 2^{-\rho k d} \widehat{\phi}(2^{2-\rho k}(\xi - x^k))$$

for some positive numbers σ_k to be chosen later and let S_k be defined by (5.2). Then

$$\widehat{S_k g_k}(\xi) = \sigma_k 2^{mk} 2^{-\rho k d} e^{2\pi i |\xi|^{1-\rho}} \widehat{\phi}(2^{2-\rho k}(\xi - x^k)).$$

Let U_k be the Fourier transform of $e^{2\pi i |\cdot|^{1-\rho}} \widehat{\phi}(2^{2-\rho k}(\cdot - x^k))$ and then a stationary phase calculation yields that for a suitable $\epsilon > 0$

$$\big|U_k(x)\big| \gtrsim 2^{kd(1+\rho)/2}$$

if $(1-\epsilon_0)2^{\rho k} \leq \big|x/|x|^{1+1/\rho} - x^k\big| \leq (1+\epsilon_0)2^{\rho k}$ for large k. Thus, we have

$$\big\|S_k g_k\big\|_{L^\infty} \gtrsim \sigma_k 2^{mk} 2^{kd(1-\rho)/2}$$

and

$$\|g_k\|_{L^\infty} \sim \sigma_k.$$

When $m > -d(1-\rho)/2$, then put $\sigma_k = 2^{-kd(m+d(1-\rho)/2)/2}$ to get

$$\Big(\sum_{k=10}^{\infty} \|g_k\|_{L^\infty}^q\Big)^{1/q} \lesssim 1$$

and

$$\Big(\sum_{k=10}^{\infty} \big\|S_k g_k\big\|_{L^\infty}^t\Big)^{1/t} = \infty$$

for all $0 < q \le \infty$ and $0 < t \le \infty$. When $m = -d(1-\rho)/2$ and $q > t$, then put $\sigma_k = k^{-1/t}$ as in Section 5. These examples prove the optimality of the hypothesis (1) and (2) of Theorem 6.2.

Now suppose $m > -d(1-\rho)/2$ and pick $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$m - 2\epsilon > -d(1-\rho)/2.$$

Then by the above argument we may choose $a \in \mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho}$ and $f \in B^{\epsilon,\infty}_\infty$ such that

$$\|f\|_{B^{\epsilon,\infty}_\infty} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \big\|T_a f\big\|_{B^{-\epsilon,\infty}_\infty} = \infty.$$

By applying $B^{\epsilon,\infty}_\infty \hookrightarrow F^{0,q}_\infty$ and $F^{0,t}_\infty \hookrightarrow B^{-\epsilon,\infty}_\infty$, we have

$$\|f\|_{F^{0,q}_\infty} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \big\|T_a f\big\|_{F^{0,t}_\infty} = \infty,$$

which establish the sharpness of Theorem 6.1.

7. **Appendix - Compoud symbols**

A useful device in the study of pseudo-differential operator is the notion of compound symbols, motivated by adjoint operators. Observe that by writing out the Fourier transform we can rewrite (1.2) as

$$T_a f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} a(x,\xi) f(y) e^{2\pi i <x-y,\xi>} dy d\xi. \tag{7.1}$$

Then the adjoint operator T_a^* can be expressed as

$$T_a^* f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} \overline{a}(y,\xi) f(y) e^{2\pi i <x-y,\xi>} dy d\xi$$

and this is not quite in the form (7.1) as the amplitude $\overline{a}(y,\xi)$ is not a function of (x,ξ). Alternatively, we introduce compound symbols. For $\rho, \delta_1, \delta_2, m \in \mathbb{R}$ a compound symbol A in $\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta_1,\delta_2}$ is a smooth function defined on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, satisfying the analogue of (1.1): for all multi-indices α, β, and γ there exists a constant $c_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}$ such that

$$\big|\partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_x^\beta \partial_y^\gamma A(x,y,\xi)\big| \le c_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}\big(1+|\xi|\big)^{m-\rho|\alpha|+\delta_1|\beta|+\delta_2|\gamma|} \text{ for } (x,y,\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d.$$

The pseudo-differential operator $T_{[A]}$ corresponding to a compound symbol A is defined by

$$T_{[A]} f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} A(x,y,\xi) f(y) e^{2\pi i <x-y,\xi>} dy d\xi, \quad \text{for } f \in S(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Denote by $Op\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta_1,\delta_2}$ the class of pseudo-differential operators with compound symbols in $\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta_1,\delta_2}$. Then the adjoint operator $(T_{[A]})^*$ is also a pseudo-differential operator

$$(T_{[A]})^* = T_{[A^*]}$$

where $A^*(x,y,\xi) = \overline{A}(y,x,\xi)$.

7.1. **Composition of pseudo-differential operators.** Let $a \in \mathcal{S}^{m_0}_{\rho_0,\delta_0}$ and $A \in \mathcal{S}^{m_1}_{\rho_1,\delta_1,\delta_2}$. Then we get

$$T_a \circ T_{[A]} f(x) = T_{[B]} f(x)$$

where

$$B(x,y,\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} a(x,\eta) A(z,y,\xi) e^{2\pi i <x-z,\eta-\xi>} d\eta dz. \tag{7.2}$$

Observe that if we put $A_y(x,\xi) := A(x,y,\xi)$ and $B_y(x,\xi) := B(x,y,\xi)$ for fixed y then

$$T_a \circ T_{A_y} = T_{B_y}$$

and $A_y \in \mathcal{S}^m_{\rho_1,\delta_1}$ uniformly in y. This implies that B_y belongs to $\mathcal{S}^{m_0+m_1}_{\rho,\delta}$ uniformly in y if

$$0 \leq \delta_1 < \rho_0 \leq 1 \tag{7.3}$$

holds where $\rho = \min(\rho_0, \rho_1)$ and $\delta = \max(\delta_0, \delta_1)$. That is,

$$\left|\partial^\alpha_\xi \partial^\beta_x B(x,y,\xi)\right| \lesssim_{\alpha,\beta} (1+|\xi|)^{m_0+m_1-\rho|\alpha|+\delta|\beta|}$$

uniformly in y. Since y involves only in A on the right hand side of (7.2), we can replace A by $\partial^\gamma_y A \in \mathcal{S}^{m_1+\delta_2|\gamma|}_{\rho_1,\delta_1,\delta_2}$ to get the estimate

$$\left|\partial^\alpha_\xi \partial^\beta_x \partial^\gamma_y B(x,y,\xi)\right| \lesssim_{\alpha,\beta} (1+|\xi|)^{m_0+m_1-\rho|\alpha|+\delta|\beta|+\delta_2|\gamma|}.$$

We conclude that if (7.3) holds then

$$T_a \circ T_{[A]} = T_{[B]} \tag{7.4}$$

where $B \in \mathcal{S}^{m_0+m_1}_{\rho,\delta,\delta_2}$.

7.2. **Analogue of Theorem 1.1, 1.2, 6.1, 6.2.** We will show that for $0 \leq \delta \leq \rho < 1$ every pseudo-differential operator $T_{[A]} \in Op\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta,\delta}$ can be written as $T_{[A]} = T_a$ for some $a \in \mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta}$ and consequently we obtain the boundedness results of $Op\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho,\rho}$ for $0 < \rho < 1$.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $0 \leq \delta \leq \rho < 1$ and $m \in \mathbb{R}$. Then every pseudo-differential operator $T_{[A]}$ corresponding to $A \in \mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta,\delta}$ can be written as $T_{[A]} = T_a$ for some $a \in \mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta}$.*

We remark that when $A(x,y,\xi) = \overline{a}(y,\xi)$, Lemma 7.1 proves that the adjoint operator of $T_a \in Op\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta}$ also belongs to the same type of class when $0 \leq \delta \leq \rho < 1$.

Proof of Lemma 7.1. Let $A \in \mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta,\delta}$. Observe that for $f \in S(\mathbb{R}^d)$

$$\begin{aligned} T_{[A]} f(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \widehat{f}(\xi) e^{2\pi i <x,\xi>} \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} A(x,y,\eta) e^{-2\pi i <x-y,\xi-\eta>} d\eta dy \Big) d\xi \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \widehat{f}(\xi) e^{2\pi i <x,\xi>} \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} A(x,x-y,\xi-\eta) e^{-2\pi i <y,\eta>} d\eta dy \Big) d\xi \end{aligned}$$

and our claim is that

$$a(x,\xi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} A(x,x-y,\xi-\eta) e^{-2\pi i <y,\eta>} d\eta dy$$

belongs to $\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta}$. Here the integral is an oscillatory integral and thus it can be interpreted as

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} A(x,x-y,\xi-\eta) \mathcal{W}\big(\epsilon y, \epsilon \eta\big) e^{-2\pi i <y,\eta>} d\eta dy$$

where $\mathcal{W} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ is a test function which is identically 1 on a neighborhood of the origin, and the limit is taken in the sense of tempered distributions.

We need to show that for any multi-indices α and β there exists a constant $C_{\alpha,\beta} > 0$ such that

$$\left|\partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_x^\beta a(x,\xi)\right| \le C_{\alpha,\beta}(1+|\xi|)^{m-\rho|\alpha|+\delta|\beta|}$$

and we shall prove the case $\alpha = \beta = 0$, otherwise apply the proof by replacing m by $m - \rho|\alpha| + \delta|\beta|$. Furthermore, we may assume $m = 0$ in the following reason. As we did in Section 2, when $n_{-m}(\xi) = \left(1+|\xi|^2\right)^{-m/2}$ we have

$$n_{-m}(D)T_{[A]} \in Op\mathcal{S}^0_{\rho,\delta,\delta}.$$

by (7.4). Once we prove $n_{-m}(D)T_{[A]} = T_a$ for some $a \in \mathcal{S}^0_{\rho,\delta}$, then

$$T_{[A]} = n_m(D)n_{-m}(D)T_{[A]} = n_m(D)T_a \in Op\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta}$$

by (2.1). Thus assume $m = 0$ and then it suffices to show

$$\left|a(x,\xi)\right| \lesssim 1. \tag{7.5}$$

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $R > 0$ denote by $B(x,R)$ a ball of radius R centered at x.

We first prove the case $\delta = \rho = 0$. There exist a constant $C_d > 0$ and a test function χ such that χ is supported in $B(0,C_d)$ and satisfies

$$\sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \chi(y-l) = 1$$

for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. By using this we write

$$\begin{aligned} a(x,\xi) &= \sum_{l,j\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} A(x,x-y,\xi-\eta)\chi(y-l)\chi(\eta-j)e^{-2\pi i<y,\eta>}d\eta dy \\ &= \sum_{|l|,|j|\le 10C_d} \ldots + \sum_{|l|\le 10C_d<|j|} \ldots + \sum_{|j|\le 10C_d<|l|} \ldots + \sum_{10C_d<|l|\le|j|} \ldots + \sum_{10C_d<|j|<|l|} \ldots \\ &:= I + II + III + IV + V. \end{aligned} \tag{7.6}$$

Observe that for each $l, j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ the integral does not exceed a constant times

$$\begin{cases} 1, & \text{uniformly in } l,j \\ |j|^{-M}, & \text{for } |j| > 10C_d \\ |l|^{-M}, & \text{for } |l| > 10C_d. \end{cases} \tag{7.7}$$

for any $M > 0$. The first bound is immediate and the others follow from an integration by parts in each variable. Of course an implicit constant for the last two bounds depends on M. We use the bound 1 for I, $|j|^{-M}$ for II, IV, and $|l|^{-M}$ for III, V with $M > 2d$ and then we establish (7.5).

Now assume $0 < \rho < 1$. Define $A_k(x,y,\xi) := A(x,y,\xi)\widehat{\phi_k}(\xi)$ where ϕ_k is an auxiliary function we used to define F- and B-norms previously. Then

$$\widetilde{A_k}(x,y,\xi) := A_k(2^{-\rho k}x, 2^{-\rho k}y, 2^{\rho k}\xi)$$

belongs to $\mathcal{S}^0_{0,0,0}$ uniformly in k because $\delta \le \rho$. Since $\{\phi_k\}$ forms a partition of unity, we write

$$\begin{aligned} a(x,\xi) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} A_k(x, x-y, \xi-\eta) e^{-2\pi i <y,\eta>} d\eta dy \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} \widetilde{A_k}\big(2^{\rho k}x, 2^{\rho k}(x-y), 2^{-\rho k}(\xi-\eta)\big) e^{-2\pi i <y,\eta>} d\eta dy \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} \widetilde{A_k}\big(2^{\rho k}x, 2^{\rho k}x-y, 2^{-\rho k}\xi-\eta\big) e^{-2\pi i <y,\eta>} d\eta dy. \end{aligned}$$

First consider the case $|\xi| \ge 20C_d$ and choose an integer k_0 satisfying

$$2^{k_0} \le |\xi| < 2^{k_0+1}.$$

Then break up $a(x,\xi)$ as

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\log_2(10C_d)-1} \dots + \sum_{k=\log_2(10C_d)}^{k_0} \dots + \sum_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty} \dots. \tag{7.8}$$

Since $\widetilde{A_k}$ is contained in $\mathcal{S}^0_{0,0,0}$ uniformly in k, each integral in the summations is bounded by a constant independent of k and thus the first one is done because it is a finite sum.

Let Θ be a Schwartz function such that $0 \le \Theta \le 1$, $\Theta(\xi) = 1$ on $\{\xi : 2^{-1} \le |\xi| \le 2\}$ and $Supp(\Theta) \subset \{\xi : 2^{-2} \le |\xi| \le 2^2\}$. Then the second one of (7.8) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=\log_2(10C_d)}^{k_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} \widetilde{A_k}\big(2^{\rho k}x, 2^{\rho k}x-y, 2^{-\rho k}\xi-\eta\big)\Theta\big(2^{-k}(\xi-2^{\rho k}\eta)\big) \\ &\times e^{-2\pi i <y,\eta>} d\eta dy \\ = &\sum_{k=\log_2(10C_d)}^{k_0} \sum_{l,j\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} \widetilde{A_k}\big(2^{\rho k}x, 2^{\rho k}x-y, 2^{-\rho k}\xi-\eta\big)\Theta\big(2^{-k}(\xi-2^{\rho k}\eta)\big) \\ &\times \chi(y-l)\chi(\eta-j) e^{-2\pi i <y,\eta>} d\eta dy \\ = &\sum_{k=\log_2(10C_d)}^{k_0} \sum_{|j|\le 2^{k_0(1-\rho)-2}} \sum_{l} \dots + \sum_{k=\log_2(10C_d)}^{k_0} \sum_{|j|> 2^{k_0(1-\rho)-2}} \sum_{l} \dots \end{aligned} \tag{7.9}$$

Observe that for $|j| \le 2^{k_0(1-\rho)-2}$

$$\big|\partial^\alpha \Theta\big(2^{-k}(\xi-2^{\rho k}\eta)\big)\big| \lesssim_{\alpha,N} 2^{-N(k_0-k)}$$

for all $N > 0$ and all multi-indices α. Then this observation and the method we used for the case $\rho = 0$ yield that the first sum in (7.9) is less than a constant times

$$\sum_{k=\log_2(10C_d)}^{k_0} 2^{-N(k_0-k)} \lesssim 1$$

for sufficiently large N. We can also prove that the second sum in (7.9) is less than a constant by using (7.7) ($|j|^{-M}$ when $|l| \le |j|$, and $|l|^{-M}$ when $|l| > |j|$), which completes the estimate of second term in (7.8).

We write the last term of (7.8) as

$$\sum_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} \widetilde{A_k}\big(2^{\rho k}x, 2^{\rho k}x-y, 2^{-\rho k}\xi-\eta\big)\Theta\big(2^{-k}(\xi-2^{\rho k}\eta)\big) e^{-2\pi i <y,\eta>} d\eta dy.$$

Then as we did, decompose the sum as

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty}\sum_{l,j\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\cdots\\ =\ &\sum_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty} I+\sum_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty} II+\sum_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty} III+\sum_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty} IV+\sum_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty} V\end{aligned}$$

like (7.6). We already know that each summand is bounded by a constant independent of k, but when we take a summation over $k_0+1\le k$ it may diverge because it is an infinite sum. In this case we observe that

$$\sum_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty}\Theta\big(2^{-k}(\xi-2^{\rho k}\eta)\big) \tag{7.10}$$

is a bounded function of η because at most a finite number of supports of all summands have an intersection and Θ itself is a bounded function. Furthermore, each derivative of (7.10) is also a bounded function by the same reason. Since $\widetilde{A_k}$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}^0_{0,0,0}$ uniformly in k, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty}\big|\partial_\eta^\alpha\partial_y^\beta\widetilde{A_k}(2^{\rho k}x,2^{\rho k}x-y,2^{-\rho k}\xi-\eta)\big|\big|\Theta\big(2^{-k}(\xi-2^{\rho k}\eta)\big)\big|\\ \lesssim_{\alpha,\beta}\ &\sum_{k=k_0+1}^{\infty}\big|\Theta\big(2^{-k}(\xi-2^{\rho k}\eta)\big)\big|\lesssim 1.\end{aligned} \tag{7.11}$$

Finally (7.7) and (7.11) give that the last sum of (7.8) is less than a constant.

When $|\xi|\le 20C_d$ then write $a(x,\xi)$ as

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\log_2(10C_d)-1}\ldots+\sum_{k=\log_2(10C_d)}^{\infty}\ldots.$$

Then the first one is bounded by a constant because it is a finite sum and the estimate for the second one is derived from the fact that

$$\sum_{k=\log_2(10C_d)}^{\infty}\Theta\big(2^{-k}(\xi-2^{\rho k}\eta)\big)$$

is a bounded function of η.

□

As a result of Lemma 7.1

$$Op\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta}\approx OP\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\delta,\delta}$$

when $0\le\delta\le\rho<1$ and thus our boundedness results also holds for $OP\mathcal{S}^m_{\rho,\rho,\rho}$ when $0<\rho<1$.

References

[1] J. M. Bony, *Calcul symbolique et propagation des singularités pour les équations aux dérivées partielles non linéaires*, Ann.Sc.E.N.S. Paris **14** (1981) 209-246.

[2] H. Bui, M. Taibleson *The characterization of the Triebel-Lizorkin spaces for $p=\infty$*, J. Fourier Anal. Appl. **6** (2000) 537-550.

[3] A. P. Calderón and R. Vaillancourt, *A class of bounded pseudo-differential operators*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **69** (1972) 1185-1187.

[4] M. Christ and A. Seeger, *Necessary conditions for vector-valued operator inequalities in harmonic analysis*, London Math. Soc. **(3)93** (2006) 447-473.

[5] C. Fefferman, *Inequalities for strongly singular convolution operators*, Acta Math. **123** (1969) 9-36.

[6] C. Fefferman, *L^p bounds for pseudo-differential operators*, Israel J. Math. **14** (1973) 413-417.
[7] C. Fefferman and E. M. Stein, *H^p spaces of several variables*, Acta Math. **129** (1972) 137-193.
[8] M. Frazier and B. Jawerth, *The φ-transform and applications to distribution spaces*, in "Function Spaces and Applications", Lecture Notes in Math. Vol. 1302, Springer-Verlag, New York/Berlin, (1988) 223-246.
[9] M. Frazier and B. Jawerth, *A discrete transform and decomposition of distribution spaces*, J. Functional Anal. **93** (1990) 34-170.
[10] M. Frazier and B. Jawerth, *Applications of the ϕ and wavelet transforms to the theory of function spaces*, Wavelets and Their Applications, pp.377-417, Jones and Bartlett, Boston, MA, 1992
[11] D. Goldberg, *A local version of real Hardy spaces*, Duke Math. J. **46** (1979) 27-42.
[12] L. Grafakos, *Modern Fourier Analysis*, Springer (2008)
[13] I. I. Hirschman, *On multiplier transformations*, Duke Math. J., **26** (1959) 221-242.
[14] L. Hörmander, *Pseudo-Differential Operators and Hypoelliptic equations*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **10** (1967) 138-183.
[15] L. Hörmander, *The analysis of linear partial differential operators III*, Springer-Verlag (1994).
[16] J. Johnsen, *Domains of pseudo-differential operators: a case for the Triebel-Lizorkin spaces*, J. Funct. Spaces Appl. **3** (2005) 263-286.
[17] J. Marschall, *Nonregular pseudo-differential operators*, J. Anal. Anwendungen **15(1)**(1996) 109-148.
[18] A. Miyachi, *On some Fourier multipliers for $H^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$*, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math. **27**(1980) 157-179.
[19] L. Päivärinta and E. Somersalo, *A generalization of the Calderón-Vaillancourt theorem to L^p and h^p*, Math. Nachr. **138** (1988) 145-156.
[20] J. Peetre, *On spaces of Triebel-Lizorkin type*, Ark. Mat. **13** (1975) 123-130.
[21] M. Pramanik, K.M. Rogers, A. Seeger, *A Calderón-Zygmund estimate with applications to generalized Radon transforms and Fourier integral operators*, Studia Mathematica, **202** (2011) 1-15.
[22] E. M. Stein, *Singular integrals, harmonic functions, and differentiability properties of functions of several variables*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 10 Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I. (1967) 316-355.
[23] M. E. Taylor , *Pseudodifferential Operators And Nonlinear PDE*, Birkhäuser, Boston (1991).
[24] H. Triebel, *Theory of Function Spaces*, Birkhauser, Basel-Boston-Stuttgart (1983).
[25] M. Yamazaki, *A quasi-homogeneous version of paradifferential operators, I. Boundedness on spaces of Besov type*, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA, Math., **33**(1986) 131-174.
[26] S. Wainger, *Special trigonometric series in k dimensions*, Memoirs of the AMS., **59**(1965).

Department of Mathematics, University of Wisconsin - Madison, , U.S.A.
E-mail address: park@math.wisc.edu